


NUNC COGNOSCO EX PARTE



TRENT UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2019 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

THE
OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

PART XI

GRENFELL AND HUNT



EGYPT EXPLORATION FUND
GRAECO-ROMAN BRANCH

THE
OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI
PART XI

EDITED WITH TRANSLATIONS AND NOTES

BY

BERNARD P. GRENFELL, D.LITT.

FELLOW OF QUEEN'S COLLEGE, OXFORD; FELLOW OF THE BRITISH ACADEMY

AND

ARTHUR S. HUNT, D.LITT.

PROFESSOR OF PAPYROLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, AND FELLOW OF QUEEN'S COLLEGE
FELLOW OF THE BRITISH ACADEMY

WITH SEVEN PLATES

LONDON

SOLD AT

THE OFFICES OF THE EGYPT EXPLORATION FUND, 37 GREAT RUSSELL STREET, W.C.
AND 527 TREMONT TEMPLE, BOSTON, MASS., U.S.A.

KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & CO., 68-74 CARTER LANE, E.C.

BERNARD QUARITCH, 11 GRAFTON STREET, NEW BOND STREET, W.

ASHER & CO., 14 BEDFORD STREET, COVENT GARDEN, W.C.

C. F. CLAY, FETTER LANE, E.C., AND 100 PRINCES STREET, EDINBURGH; AND

HUMPHREY MILFORD, AMEN CORNER, E.C., AND 29-35 WEST 32ND STREET, NEW YORK, U.S.A.

1915

All rights reserved

PA3315 .08 .Pt. 11

PRINTED IN ENGLAND
AT THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

PREFACE

THE present volume, like Part V, consists of literary pieces, with the exception of the Calendar of Church Services at Oxyrhynchus (1357), which on account of its special interest is included with the theological texts. The papyri of Antiphon Sophistes (1364) and Thucydides (1376) belong to the first of the large literary finds in 1906, the lyric pieces and one of the Hesiod fragments (1359) to the second, of which much still remains to be published. The invocation of Isis (1380) and praise of Imouthes-Asclepius (1381) were found in 1903, the Byzantine classical pieces in 1897, the rest chiefly in 1905-6.

In editing the new classical fragments, especially the poetical pieces (1358-1363), we have received valuable suggestions and criticisms from Prof. Gilbert Murray. The assistance afforded by Mr. T. W. Allen, Dr. J. V. Bartlet, the Rev. F. E. Brightman, Mr. W. E. Crum, Mr. F. Ll. Griffith, Mr. E. Lobel, Mr. J. G. Milne, the Rev. E. M. Walker, and Prof. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff is acknowledged in connexion with the individual papyri.

Part XII, consisting of documents of the late Ptolemaic, Roman, and early Byzantine periods, is in an advanced state of preparation, and we hope to issue it early in 1916.

BERNARD P. GRENFELL.

ARTHUR S. HUNT.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, OXFORD,
JUNE, 1915.

239603

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	v
LIST OF PLATES	viii
TABLE OF PAPYRI	ix
NOTE ON THE METHOD OF PUBLICATION AND LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xi

TEXTS

I. THEOLOGICAL FRAGMENTS (1351-1357)	I
II. NEW CLASSICAL TEXTS (1358-1368)	44
III. EXTANT CLASSICAL AUTHORS (1369-1379)	121
IV. GRAECO-EGYPTIAN LITERARY PAPYRI (1380-1384)	190
V. HOMER FRAGMENTS (1385-1398)	242
VI. MINOR CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS (1399-1404)	245

APPENDIX

LIST OF OXYRHYNCHUS AND HIBEH PAPYRI DISTRIBUTED	248
--	-----

INDICES

I. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS	253
II. PERSONAL NAMES	262
III. GEOGRAPHICAL	263
IV. RELIGION	264
V. GENERAL INDEX OF GREEK WORDS	267
VI. SUBJECTS DISCUSSED IN THE INTRODUCTIONS AND NOTES	273
VII. PASSAGES DISCUSSED	276

LIST OF PLATES

- | | | | |
|------|---|-----------|----------------------|
| I. | 1351 recto, 1355 recto, 1357 Col. i. | | } <i>at the end.</i> |
| II. | 1358 Fr. 2, 1399 | | |
| III. | 1359 Frs. 2, 4, 1361 Frs. 1, 4, 1376 Col. iv | | |
| IV. | 1362 Fr. 1, Col. i | | |
| V. | 1364 Fr. 1, Cols. v-vii | | |
| VI. | 1363, 1365, 1379 | | |
| VII. | 1369 Frs. 1-2 recto, 1370 Frs. 3 recto, 9 verso, 1371 recto | | |

TABLE OF PAPYRI

(An asterisk denotes texts not printed in full)

		DATE	PAGE
1351.	Leviticus xxvii (on vellum ; Plate I)	4th cent.	1
1352.	Psalms lxxxii, lxxxiii (on vellum)	Early 4th cent.	2
1353.	First Epistle of Peter v (on vellum)	4th cent.	5
1354.	Epistle to the Romans i	6th or 7th cent.	6
1355.	Epistle to the Romans viii (Plate I)	3rd cent.	9
1356.	Philo	3rd cent.	12
1357.	Calendar of Church Services (Plate I)	535-6	19
1358.	Hesiod, <i>Catalogue</i> iii (Plate II)	3rd cent.	44
1359.	Hesiod, <i>Catalogue</i> (Plate III)	Early 3rd cent.	52
1360.	Alcaeus	Late 2nd cent.	56
1361.	Bacchylides, <i>Scolia</i> (Plate III)	1st cent.	65
1362.	Callimachus, <i>Aetia</i> (Plate IV)	1st cent.	83
1363.	Callimachus, <i>Iambi</i> (Plate VI)	2nd or early 3rd cent.	90
1364.	Antiphon Sophistes, <i>Περὶ Ἀληθείας</i> i (Plate V)	Early 3rd cent.	92
1365.	History of Sicyon (Plate VI)	3rd cent.	104
1366.	Fragment of an Attic Orator	Late 3rd cent.	111
1367.	Heraclides Lembus, <i>Epitome of Hermippus</i> , <i>Περὶ Νομοθετῶν</i>	Late 2nd cent.	113
1368.	Romance	3rd cent.	119
1369.	Sophocles, <i>Oedipus Tyrannus</i> (Plate VII)	5th cent.	121
1370.	Euripides, <i>Medea</i> and <i>Orestes</i> (Plate VII)	5th cent.	126
1371.	Aristophanes, <i>Clouds</i> with scholia (Plate VII)	5th cent.	134
1372.	Aristophanes, <i>Frogs</i>	5th cent.	138
1373.	Aristophanes, <i>Peace</i> and <i>Knights</i>	5th cent.	142
1374.	Aristophanes, <i>Wasps</i>	5th cent.	145
1375.	Herodotus vii	Early 2nd cent.	154
1376.	Thucydides vii (Plate III)	Late 2nd or early 3rd cent.	155
1377.	Demosthenes, <i>De Corona</i>	Late 1st cent. B. C.	186

TABLE OF PAPYRI

	DATE	PAGE
1378. Demosthenes, <i>Contra Midiam</i>	3rd cent.	187
1379. Livy i (Plate VI)	Late 3rd cent.	188
1380. Invocation of Isis	Early 2nd cent.	190
1381. Praise of Imouthes-Asclepius	2nd cent.	221
1382. Tale of Sarapis and Syrion	2nd cent.	234
1383. Sailor's Song	Late 3rd cent.	236
1384. Medical Recipes; Theological Extracts	5th cent.	238
*1385. Homer, <i>Iliad</i> ii	5th cent.	242
*1386. Homer, <i>Iliad</i> iv	3rd cent.	242
*1387. Homer, <i>Iliad</i> v	2nd cent.	242
*1388. Homer, <i>Iliad</i> vi	1st cent. B. C.	242
*1389. Homer, <i>Iliad</i> vii (on vellum)	Late 4th cent.	242
*1390. Homer, <i>Iliad</i> ix	5th cent.	242
1391. Homer, <i>Iliad</i> xi	5th cent.	242
*1392. Homer, <i>Iliad</i> xv	3rd cent.	243
*1393. Homer, <i>Iliad</i> xvi (on vellum)	5th cent.	244
*1394. Homer, <i>Odyssey</i> i	5th cent.	244
*1395. Homer, <i>Odyssey</i> vi (on vellum)	4th cent.	244
*1396. Homer, <i>Odyssey</i> ix	5th cent.	244
1397. Homer, <i>Odyssey</i> xviii with scholia	5th cent.	244
*1398. Homer, <i>Odyssey</i> xxi	3rd cent.	244
1399. Title of Choerilus' Epic (Plate II)	Late 2nd or 3rd cent.	245
1400. Fragment of a Comedy	2nd or early 3rd cent.	245
1401. Fragments of a Tragedy	5th cent.	246
1402. Aristophanes (?) with scholia	5th cent.	246
1403. Aristophanes (?)	5th cent.	247
1404. Latin Fable	3rd cent.	247

NOTE ON THE METHOD OF PUBLICATION AND LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

THE general method followed in this volume is the same as that in Parts I–X. Of the new classical texts, 1360–2 are printed in a dual form, a literal transcript being accompanied by a reconstruction in modern style. In the others, and in the fragments of extant authors, the originals are reproduced except for separation of words, capital initials in proper names, expansion of abbreviations, and supplements of lacunae. Additions or corrections by the same hand as the body of the text are in small thin type, those by a different hand in thick type. The Graeco-Egyptian literary texts and 1357, which is a non-literary document, are given in modern form with accentuation and punctuation. Abbreviations and symbols are resolved; additions and corrections are incorporated in the text, their occurrence being recorded in the critical apparatus, where also faults of orthography, &c., are corrected if they seemed likely to give rise to any difficulty. Iota adscript has been printed when so written, otherwise iota subscript is employed. Square brackets [] indicate a lacuna, round brackets () the resolution of a symbol or abbreviation, angular brackets < > a mistaken omission in the original, braces { } a superfluous letter or letters, double square brackets [[]] a deletion in the original. Dots placed within brackets represent the approximate number of letters lost or deleted; dots outside brackets indicate mutilated or otherwise illegible letters. Letters with dots underneath them are to be considered doubtful. Heavy Arabic numerals refer to the texts of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri in this volume and Parts I–X, ordinary numerals to lines, small Roman numerals to columns.

The abbreviations used in referring to papyrological publications are practically those adopted in the *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, viz. :—

P. Amh. = The Amherst Papyri (Greek), Vols. I–II, by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt.

Archiv = *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*.

B. G. U. = Aeg. Urkunden aus den K. Museen zu Berlin, Griechische Urkunden.

P. Brit. Mus. = Greek Papyri in the British Museum, Vols. I–II, by F. G. Kenyon; Vol. III, by F. G. Kenyon and H. I. Bell; Vol. IV, by H. I. Bell.

- C. P. R. = Corpus Papyrorum Raineri, Vol. I, by C. Wessely.
- P. Cairo Maspero = Catalogue des Antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire, Papyrus grecs d'époque byzantine, by J. Maspero.
- P. Fay. = Fayûm Towns and their Papyri, by B. P. Grenfell, A. S. Hunt, and D. G. Hogarth.
- P. Flor. = Papiri Fiorentini, Vols. I and III, by G. Vitelli; Vol. II, by D. Comparetti.
- P. Giessen = Griechische Papyri zu Giessen, Vol. I, by E. Kornemann, O. Eger, and P. M. Meyer.
- P. Grenf. = Greek Papyri, Series I, by B. P. Grenfell; Series II, by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt.
- P. Hamburg = Griech. Papyrusurkunden der Hamburgischen Stadtbibliothek, by P. M. Meyer.
- P. Hibeh = The Hibeh Papyri, Part I, by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt.
- P. Klein. Form. = Griech. Papyrusurkunden kleineren Formats, Studien z. Palaeogr. und Papyruskunde iii, viii, by C. Wessely.
- P. Leipzig = Griechische Urkunden der Papyrussammlung zu Leipzig, Vol. I, by L. Mitteis.
- P. Leyden = Papyri Graeci Musei Antiquarii Publici Lugduni-Batavi, by C. Leemanns.
- P. Oxy. = The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Parts I-VI and X, by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt; Parts VII-IX, by A. S. Hunt.
- P. Par. = Les Papyrus grecs du Musée du Louvre, *Notices et Extraits*, t. xviii. 2, by W. Brunet de Presle and E. Egger.
- P. Petrie = The Flinders Petrie Papyri, Parts I-II, by J. P. Mahaffy; Part III, by J. P. Mahaffy and J. G. Smyly.
- P. Reinach = Papyrus grecs et démotiques, by T. Reinach.
- P. Rev. Laws = The Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus, by B. P. Grenfell, with an introduction by J. P. Mahaffy.
- P. Ryl. = Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the Rylands Library, Vol. I, by A. S. Hunt; Vol. II, by J. de M. Johnson, V. Martin, and A. S. Hunt.
- P. Ryl. Coptic = Catalogue of the Coptic Papyri, by W. E. Crum.
- P. S. I. = Papiri della Società Italiana, Vols. I-III, by G. Vitelli and others.
- P. Stud. Pal. = Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde, by C. Wessely.
- P. Tebt. = The Tebtunis Papyri, Part I, by B. P. Grenfell, A. S. Hunt, and J. G. Smyly; Part II, by B. P. Grenfell, A. S. Hunt, and E. J. Goodspeed.

I. THEOLOGICAL FRAGMENTS

1351. LEVITICUS xxvii.

2.6 × 5.9 cm. Fourth century. Plate I (recto).

This small fragment comes from a vellum leaf which contained double columns and when complete must have been nearly square in shape. It is inscribed with upright uncials of medium size and the regular Biblical type; though somewhat heavy, they are well formed and probably not later than the fourth century. A new paragraph is marked by a projection of a couple of letters into the margin, as well as by a paragraphus (l. 6; cf. e. g. 1169). At the ends of lines an unusual unevenness was permitted. The quality of the text is not apparent from so short a specimen; a minor agreement with a few cursive MSS. is noticeable in l. 15.

Recto. Plate I.

Col. i.		Col. ii.
.
		το τ[ο επιπεμπτον 15
		του α[ργυριου της τει
.		5 μης κα[ι εσται αυτω
.	αυτ]ο 12	εαν δε απο του [αγρου της 16
[ο ιερευς ανα μ]εσον		[κα]τασχεσεω[ς αυτου
.		[αγια]ση ανθρω[πος τω
		[κυριω] και εστ[αι
	

Verso.

Col. i.		Col. ii.
.
10 ο αγι]ασας 19		
[αυτον προσθ]ησει το	
[επιπεμπτον] του αρ		φ[εσεως αποδοθησε 24

[γυριου π]ρος την τει
 [μην α]υτου και ε[σται
 15 [αυτω] εαν δε μ[η λυ 20
 [τρως]ηται τ[ον

4-5. A omits της τιμης.

8. [αγια]ση: αγιασει FM.

15-16. λυτρωσ]ηται: so the cursives 15, 53, 108, 118; λυτρωται is the usual reading.

1352. PSALMS lxxxii, lxxxiii.

13·1 × 10·5 cm.

Early fourth century.

A practically complete vellum leaf from a book of the Psalms. The stichometrical arrangement of lines, for which 1226 supplies an early instance, is not here adopted, but stichometrical divisions are marked, somewhat erratically, by means of double dots (cf. 657 and 1078). The letters, which are of a third to fourth century type, show some variation both of size and formation; as a rule they are upright, but in l. 21 the scribe has lapsed into a sloping style. At its best this hand is rather similar to that of 849, and is no doubt of approximately the same date. θεός and κύριος are abbreviated as usual, but not υιός (ll. 8, 37). Vertical and horizontal lines were drawn with a hard point as boundaries of the column, but there are no apparent traces of horizontal ruling within the space so marked. Alterations here and there have been made by a corrector who used a small cursive script. The pagination is original. The text is of a markedly 'mixed' character. An agreement with R is noticeable in l. 42, and another with the Vetus Latina against all other authorities in l. 15. In l. 34 a reading of ART has been substituted, presumably by the diorthotes, for that of B^x. Peculiar variants, apart from the spelling of proper names, occur in ll. 11, 15, 17, 21, 26.

Verso.

κατα σου διαθηκην διεθοντο : τα ροθ lxxxii. 6, 7
 σκηνωματα των Ιδουμαιων και οι
 Ισμαηλειται Μωαβ' : και οι Αγγαρη
 νοι Γαιβα και Αμμων : και Αμαληκ' 8
 5 και αλλοφυλοι : μετα των κατοι
 κουντων Τυρον : και γαρ και Ασσουρ 9

συνπαρεγενετο μετ αυτων : εγε

νηθησαν εις αντιλημψ^υ τοις υιοις
 Δωτ' :

10

διαψαλμα

^{ον} ποιησωμεν [α]υτοις ωσ τη ^{γη} Μαδι >

10

αμ' και τω σωσεισαρα : ωσ ο Ιαβειν

εν τω χειμαρρω Κεισων : εξολε

11

θρευθησαν : εν Αερδωμ' εγενηθη

15

σαν κοπρος τη γη : εθου τους αρ

12

χοντας αυτων ωσ τον Ωρηδ' και

Ζηβ' και Ζεβεβ' και Σαλαμαν : α

παντας τους αρχοντας αυτων : οι

13

τινες ειπαν κληρονομησωμε

20

εαυτοις το αγιαστηριον του θυ :

ο θς μου εθου αυτους ωσ τροχον :

14

ωσ καλαμην κατα προσωπον >

Recto.

ανεμου : ωσει πυρ ο διαφλεξει δρυ^{ρπ}

15

μον : ωσει φλοξ κατακαυσαι ορη : ου

16

25 τως καταδιωξεις αυτους εν τη κα

ταιγιδι σου : και εν τη οργη σου κατα

ξεις αυτους : πληρωσον τα προσω

17

πα αυτων ατειμιας : και ζητησου

σιν το ονομ[α [[αυτ]ων ατειμιας : κ[α]ι

30 ζητησουσιν το ονομα σου κ̄ε :]] αισχυ

18

θητωσαν και ταραχθητωσαν εις τον

αιωνα του αιωνος : και εντραπητω

σαν και απολεσθωσαν [:] και γνωτωσαν

19

οτι ονομα σοι κ̄ς : συ μονος [[ει]] υψιστος

35 επι πασαν την γην :

πγ

εις το τελος υπερ των ληνω

Ixxxiii.

τοις υιοις Κορε ψαλμος
 ως αγαπητα τα σκηνωματα σου $\overline{\kappa\epsilon}$: 2
 των δυναμεων : επιποθει και εκ 3
 40 λειπει η ψυχη μου εις τας αυλας του
 $\overline{\kappa\upsilon}$: η καρδια μου και η σαρχ^ν μου η
 γαλλιασατο επι τον $\overline{\theta\nu}$ τον ζωντα :
 και γαρ στρουθιον ευρεν εαυτω 4

1. διεθοντο : 1. διεθεντο.
 4. Γαιβα : Γαιβαλ \aleph^{c-a} ; Γεβαλ AT, Ναιβαλ B.
 5. και is omitted by $\aleph^{c-a}T$ and many cursives.
 10. διαψαλμα : om. ART.
 11. ποιησον, the corrected reading, is that of the MSS.
 αυτοις : αυτους R. There is no other authority for the insertion of γη after τη.
 12. 1. Σεισαρα (Σισαρα B^bAT). Possibly the superfluous letters were dotted by the corrector (cf. ll. 29, 34), for dots, if they had been inserted, would be no longer visible in this place.
 13. Κεισων : Κισσω(ν) A.
 εξολεθρευθησαν : εξωλεθρ. A, εξωλοθρ. B^{ab}.
 14. Αερδωμ : cf. the cursive 276 Αερδωρ, 293 Αελδωρ ; Αενδωρ B \aleph ART. The δ has a dot over it and may be meant to be cancelled ; cf. ll. 29, 34.
 15. κοπρος : ως κοπρος B, ωσει κ. \aleph ART.
 τη γη : της γης R.
 εθου : so Vet. Lat. *posuisti* ; θου other MSS.
 16. Ωρηδ : Ωρηβ MSS.
 17. Ζεβεβ : Ζεβεε MSS.
 Σαλαμαν : Σελμανα B, Σαλμανα \aleph AR^a (Σαλμαν R*) T, Σαλμαναν a number of cursives.
 απαντας : παντας MSS.
 20. αγιαστηριον : so \aleph AT ; θυσιαστηριον BR.
 21. εθου : cf. l. 15 ; θου MSS.
 23. ανεμου : πυρος \aleph^* . R omits ο after πυρ.
 24. κατακαυσαι : κατακαυσει R.
 26. καταξεις : παραξεις B \aleph A, παραξης T, συνπαραξεις R.
 28. ζητησωσιν T.
 29. ονομα : προσωπον A.
 29-30. A dittography of αυτων . . . ονομα has been inaccurately removed. In l. 29 the repeated letters have had dots placed above them ; in l. 30 this method of deletion was abandoned and a round bracket inserted, but not in quite the right position. A corresponding bracket no doubt preceded αυτων in the previous line.
 34. ει, as originally written, is found in B \aleph ; om. ART. The two letters have been cancelled by dots added above the line. ο υψιστος R*.
 37. τοις : om. R.
 39. επεποθει R.
 41. κ(υριο)ν : θ(εο)ν \aleph^* . ηγαλλιασατο, as originally written, occurs also in the cursives I 14, 202, 204. The alteration was made by the first hand.
 42. τον θ(εο)ν τον ζωντα : so R ; θ(εο)ν ζωντα B \aleph AT.

1353. FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER v.

13.5 × 10.1 cm.

Fourth century.

A leaf of thin vellum, broken and worm-eaten, but showing approximately the original dimensions. No clear traces of ruling are discernible. To the small size of the page the round uncial writing is on a rather disproportionately large scale; the hand bears a general resemblance to that of the Codex Sinaiticus, though both the lines and the individual letters are there rather less widely spaced. There is no clear instance of punctuation. Of the common angular sign used to fill up short lines there is one doubtful example in l. 3. θεός and Χριστός were contracted as usual. The pagination number entered by a different hand on one side of the leaf shows that the volume was of considerable compass.

The text appears to have stood in no close relationship to that of any of the main authorities. An agreement with B against most other testimony is noticeable in l. 13 (cf. l. 25), but there are divergences elsewhere, e. g. ll. 17, 27. A variant not otherwise attested occurs in l. 6, and there is certainly one reading, more probably two, which have hitherto rested on much later authority (ll. 11, 34); cf. in this respect 1075. introd., 1170.

Recto.	Verso.
δωσι χαριν τ[α]πεινω v. 5, 6	σκη σμων [υ]μων α[δε]λφοτη
θη[τ]ε ουν ὑπο την κρ[α]	τι επιτελεισθε [ο] δε θς 10
ται[α]ν χειρα του θυ̅ ἰ>	20 πασης χαριτ[ο]ς [ο] καλε
να υμας ὑψωση εν	σας ημας εις την αιω
5 καιρω πασαν [τ]ην με 7	νιο[ν] αυτου δοξαν εν
ριμνα[ν] ὑμων ἐπιρι	[Χω ολιγ]ον π[α]θοντας
ψατε επ αυ[τον] οτι αυ	[αυτος κα]ταρτιει στη
τω μελει π[ε]ρι υμων	25 [ριξει σθ]ενωσει αυτω 11
νηψατε γρη[γορησα 8	[κρατος ει]ς τους αιωνας
10 [τε] ο αντι[δικος] υμ[ω]	[των αιω]νων αμ[ην]
[ο δια]βο[λος] ωσ λε]ων	δ[ια Σιλουανου] υμιν 12
[ωρ]υομεν[ος] περιπα	[του πιστ]ου αδε[λφου]
[τει] ζητων [κα]τ[α]πει̅	30 ω[ς λογιζ]ομαι δι[ο]λι
[ω α]ντιστητε̅ στε 9	γ[ω]ν εγραψα παρ[ακα
15 [ρε]οι τη πι[σ]τει̅ ειδο	λων και επιμαρτ[υρων]

[τε]ς τα αυτα των πα
[θημα]τ[ων] τη ε[ν] κο

ταυτη[ν] ειναι αλη[θη]
χαριν θ[υ] εις ην [στητε]
35 ασ[π]αζετ[αι ν]μ[α]s 13

3. *χειρα*: so BKL; *χειραν* **NA**. The complementary mark at the end of the line is uncertain.

4. A dark mark above the line after *υψωση* is probably not to be regarded as a stop. A diaeresis over *υ* of *υμας* is likely to have disappeared in a lacuna.

5. *καιρω*: A adds *επισκοπης*.

6. *επιριψατε*: *επιρ(ρ)ιψαντες* MSS.

9-10. It may be inferred from the space that *στι* did not precede *ο* as in **NC**L.

11. [*ο δια*]β[ο]λ[ος]: the β, of which the vestige is hardly to be mistaken, is slightly to the right of *ο* of *ωρ]υομενος*, and since *ω* is an exceptionally broad letter it is clear that *δια* does not fill the available space. The addition of the article appears to be peculiar to the tenth-century cursive 13; another agreement, however, with that MS., which Eichhorn described as the queen of the cursives, is found in l. 34 below.

13. [*κατα*]πει(ν): so B (*καταπειν*), Westcott-Hort; *τινα καταπειν* **NKL** &c., *τινα καταπιη* A &c. The common spelling *καταπειν* is found also in **N*** (*καταπιν*).

17. *κοσμο*: so AKL &c.; *τω κοσμο* **BN**.

18. K transposes *υμων αδελφοτητι*; L omits *υμων*.

19. *επιτελεισθε* is for *-σθαι*.

21. *ημας*: so K; *υμας* **BNAL**.

22. *δοξαν*: *βασιλειαν και δοξαν* L.

23. There is not room for *τω* which in B precedes *Χριστω*, nor for *Ιησου* which AKL add after it.

24. *κο]ταρτιει*: *καταρτισει* **BNA**; *καταρτισαι υμας* KL.

25. **NKL** &c. add *θεμελιωσει* after *σθενωσει*; BA agree with 1353 in its omission.

26. *ς* of *εις* is slightly to the left of *ν* of *σθ]ενωσει* and directly over the first *ν* of *αιω]νων*. It therefore appears that the reading here was still shorter than that of BA, and perhaps *το* was omitted, or *η δοξα* may have replaced *το κρατος* as in cursive 45. **NL** have *η δοξα και το κρατος*, **K** *η δοξα κρατος*.

27. [*των αιω*]νων: so **NAKL** &c.; om. B.

32. There would be no room for *και* (**N**) at the end of the line.

34. θ[(*εο*)]υ: *του θεου* all uncial MSS. But though the letters *νθ* here are damaged and indistinct, there can be no doubt from the space that *του* was omitted, as in a few cursives, including 13. At the end of the line *εστηκατε* (KL) would obviously be much too long.

1354. EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS i.

23.2 × 10.3 cm.

Sixth or seventh century.

This papyrus leaf containing the beginning of the Epistle to the Romans is in far from good condition. One side is broken away and other damage has been sustained, especially on the verso, where decipherment is in places difficult. When complete, if the margin at the bottom of the columns was similar to that

at the top, the leaf was about 28 cm. high, and its breadth may be estimated at about 18 cm. The upright script, large and very heavy, is in the later Byzantine style; similar hands are seen e. g. in the illustrated chronicle edited by Bauer and Strzygowski, *Denkschr. Wiener Akad.* li. 204, and the papyrus codex of Cyril Alex. *De adoratione* (New Palaeogr. Soc. Plate 203). The ink is of the reddish-brown colour common at that period. A high stop is used in l. 29 and a paragraphus occurs below l. 33, the initial letter of the following paragraph being also enlarged. The usual contractions are found, including that of *υἱός*, though this word is once written out (l. 6). Textually the fragment is of slight interest.

Recto.

προς Ρ]ωμ]αι]ους

[Παυλος δουλ]ος Ι]υ Χ]υ κλητος απο	i. 1
[στολος αφωρι]σμενος εις ευαγγελι]ο	
[θ]υ ο προε]πηγγειλατο δια τω	2
5 [προφητων] αυτου εν γραφαις α	
[γλαις περι το]υ υ]ιου αυτου του γε	3
[νομενου εκ σ]περματος Δ]αδ κατα	
[σαρκα του ορ]ισθεντος υ]υ θ]υ εν	4
[δυναμει κατα] π]να αγιωσυνης εξ α	
10 [ναστασεως υ]εκρων Ι]υ Χ]υ του κ]υ	
[ημων δι ου] ελαβομεν χαριν	5
[και αποστολην ε]ι]ς υ]π[ακοην] πιστε	
[ως εν πασιν τοις εθνεσιν υ]περ τ]ο]υ	
[ονοματος αυτου εν οι]ς εστε και [υ]	6
15 [μεις κλητοι Ι]υ Χ]υ πα]σιν τοις ουσι	7
[εν Ρωμη αγα]πητοις θ]υ κλητοις	
[αγιοις χαρι]ς υ]μιν και ειρηνη α	
[πο θ]υ π]ρος ημω]ν και κ]υ Ι]υ Χ]υ	
[. τ]ω θ]ω μου δι[α] Ι]υ Χ]υ	8
20 [περι παντων υ]μων οτι η πιστις	
[υμων καταγγε]λλ[ε]τε εν ολω τω	
[κοσμω μαρτυ]ς γαρ μ[ο]υ ε[στιν ο]	9
[θ]ς ω λατρευω] εν π[νι] μου εν τω	

Verso.

ευαγγελιω του $\bar{\upsilon}\nu$ α[υτου ως αδια
 25 λ[ι]πτως μνειαν υ[μων ποιουμαι
 παντο[τ]ε υπερ των [προσευχων μου 10
 δεομενος ει πως η[δη ποτε ευοδω
 θησομαι εν τω θε[ληματι του $\bar{\theta}\nu$ ελθει
 προς υμας· επιποθ[ω γαρ ιδειν υμας 11
 30 ἵνα τι μεταδω χαρι[σμα υμιν $\bar{\pi}\nu\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\bar{o}$
 εις το σιτηχηθηνα[ι υμας τουτο δε εστι 12
 συνπαρακληθηνε ε[ν υμιν δια της
 εν αλ[λ]ηλοις πιστ[εως υμων τε και εμου
 $\bar{O}\nu$ [θελω δε υμας αγνοειν αδελφοι ο 13
 35 τι [πολλακις προεθεμην ελθειν
 π[ρ]ο[ς] [υμας και εκωλυθην αχρι του δευ
 ρο ἵνα τι[να καρ]πον [σχω και εν υμιν
 καθως και εν τοις λ[οιποις εθνεσιν Ελ 14
 λησιν τε και βαρβα[ροις σοφοις τε και α
 40 νοητοις οφιλητη[ς ειμι ουτω το κατ ε 15
 με προθυμον κα[ι υμιν τοις εν Ρωμη
 ευαγγε[λι]σθ[αι ου γαρ επαισχυνομαι το 16
 ευ[α]γγ[ε]λι[ον] δυνα[μι]ς γαρ $\bar{\theta}\nu$
 [.] . . . [

2. Ι(ησο)υ Χ(ριστο)υ: so \aleph AEGKL &c.; Χριστου Ιησου B and 209 (early fourth cent.).

4. The supplement is a trifle short; perhaps a small blank space was left after θ(εο)υ. Line 11 is analogous.

16. εν Ρωμη: om. G, which has εν αγαπη for αγαπητοις. E omits αγαπ. θεου.

18. 209 alone has Χ(ριστο)υ Ιη(σο)υ, as in verse 1. A blank space large enough for three or four letters was left at the end of this line.

19. How the initial lacuna here should be filled remains doubtful. The ω of τ]ω stands slightly to the left of the κ of και in the line above and directly above μ of υ]μων in the line below, and there is evidently not room for πρωτον μεν ευχαριστω, the ordinary reading. There is some authority for the omission of μεν (so 40*, Chrys., and some versions), but this reduction would hardly suffice unless there was also a lipography of the syllable -τω. Possibly πρωτον was written \bar{a} .

21. Ι. καταγγε]λλ[ε]ται; cf. l. 32.

22. μ[ο]υ: so B \aleph ACD^eEKL &c.; μοι D*G.

26. υπερ: l. επι with the MSS.

31. l. *στηριχθηνα*[ι. The supplement is of full length and the reading of A, *τουτεστιν*, would be quite suitable. The ε of δε may of course have been elided.

32. l. *συνπαρακληθηται*; cf. l. 21.

34. Whether the papyrus had *ου θελω* or *ουκ οιομαι* (D*G) cannot be determined.

41. G omits *τοις εν Ρωμη*.

42. It seems likely enough on considerations of space that the terminal *-αι* was written as ε once or even twice in the lacuna.

1355. EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS viii.

Fr. I 11.2 × 4.4 cm. Third century. Plate I (recto).

The following fragments of a leaf from a papyrus book are in an upright informal hand of much the same character as 1171, though smaller in size; it may be assigned with probability to the third century. A paragraphus below l. 53 is the only form of stop, and no other signs occur except the diaeresis. *θεός* and *πνεῦμα* certainly were contracted, and that the other ordinary abbreviations were used may be inferred with security from the spacing. A correction by a second hand is found in l. 17.

Unfortunately the leaf is badly mutilated, the loss of more than half of every line depriving it of much of its value for critical purposes. The text appears to have been of good quality, showing, like 1171, a general agreement with the Codex Vaticanus, from which the two definite divergences are the avoidance of the vulgar spelling *ἐφ'* in l. 16, and an illegible reading in l. 17, where the unknown variant *ελευθερ]ονται απο* for *ελευθερωθησεται απο* has been inserted by the corrector.

Verso.

	ο]υ [τη σ]αρκι	viii. 12
	[του κατα σαρκα ζην ει γαρ κατα σαρκα ζ]ητ[ε] μελ	13
	[λετε αποθνησκειν ει δε π̄νι τας πραξει]ς του σω	
	[ματος θανατουτε ζησεσθε οσοι γαρ π̄νι θῡ αγον	14
5	[ται ουτοι ῡι θῡ εισιν ου γαρ ελαβετε π̄να] δουλειας.	15
	[παλιν εις φοβον αλλα ελαβετε π̄νᾱ υιοθε]σias εν	
	[ω κραζομεν αββα ο π̄ηρ̄ αυτο το π̄νᾱ συ]νμαρτυ	16
	[ρει τω π̄νι ημων οτι εσμεν τ]εκνα θ[ῡ ει δε] τεκνα	17
	[και κληρονομοι κληρονομοι] μεν θῡ συνκληρονο	
10	[μοι δε Χ̄ῡ ειπερ συνπασχομε]ν ινα και συνδοξα	

- [σθωμεν λογιζομαι γαρ οτι ουκ] αξια [τ]α παθηματα 18
 [του νυν καιρου προς την μελλ]ουσαν δ[ο]ξ[α]ν αποκα
 [λυφθηναι εις ημας η γαρ απο]καραδ[ο]κ[ια] της [κ]τι 19
 [σεως την αποκαλυψιν των] ὕων του θῦ απεξ
 15 [δεχεται τη γαρ ματαιοτητι η] κτισις υπεταγη 20
 [ουχ εκουσα αλλα δια τον υποτ]αξαντα [ε]π ελπιδι
 [ο]νται απ[ο]
 [οτι και αυτη η κτισις ελευθερ]ωθη[. .] της δου 21
 [λειας της φθορας εις την ελε]υθεριαν της δοξης
 [των τεκνων του θῦ οίδαμεν] γαρ οτ[ι] πασα η κτι 22
 20 [σις συνστεναζει και συνωδιν]ει αχρ[ι] του νυν
 3 lines lost.
 βλεπο]μενη 24
 25 [ουκ εστιν ελπις ο γαρ βλεπει τις ελπιζει ει] δε ο ου 25
 [βλεπομεν ελπιζομεν δι υπομονης απ]εκδεχ[ο]
 [μεθα ωσαυτως δε και το πᾶν]α συναντιλα]μβανεται 26
 [τη ασθενεια ημων το γαρ τι προσευξω]μεθα κα
 [θο δει ουκ οίδαμεν αλλα αυτο το πᾶν]α υπερε]ν[τ]υγχα
 30 [νει στεναγμοις αλαλητοις ο δε εραυνων τας καρ]διας 27

Recto. Plate I.

-
 τις [εγκαλεσει κατα εκλεκτων θῦ θς] ο δικαιων τις 33, 34
 ο κατ[ακρινων Xs Is] ο αποθανων μαλλον δε εγερθεις
 ος κα[ι] εστιν εν δεξια του θῦ ος και εντυγχανει υπερ
 ημω[ν] τις ημας χωρισει απο της αγαπης του Xυ 35
 35 θλιψ[ις η στενοχωρια η διωγμος η λιμος η γυμνοτης
 η κιν]δυνος η μαχαιρα καθως γεγραπται οτι ενεκεν 36
 σου θ[α]νατουμ[ε]θα ολην την ημεραν ελογισθημεν
 ως προβατα σφα[γης] αλλ εν τουτοις πασιν υπερνικω 37
 μεν δια του αγα[πησαντος] ημας πεπεισμαι γαρ οτι 38
 40 ουτε θανατος ου[τε] ζωη ουτε αγγελοι ουτε αρχαι ου
 τε ενεστωτα ου[τε] μελλοντα ουτε δυναμεις ουτε 39
 ὕψωμα ουτε β[α]θος ουτε τις κτισις ετερα δυνησεται

- [η]μας χωρισαι απ[ο της αγαπης του θυ της εν Xω Iυ
 [τ]ω κω ημων [αληθειαν λεγω εν Xω ου ψευδομαι ix. 1
 45 συνμαρτυρουσης [μοι της συνειδησεως μου εν πνι
 αγιω οτι λυπη μ[οι εστιν μεγαλη και αδιαλειπτος ο 2
 δυνη τη καρδια μ[ου ηυχομην γαρ αναθεμα ειναι αυ 3
 τος εγω απο του Xυ υπερ των αδελφων μου των συγγε
 νων μου κατα σ[αρκα
 3 lines lost.
 αιων[ας αμην ουχ οιον δε οτι εκπεπτωκεν ο λογος 5, 6
 του θυ ο[υ γαρ παντες οι εξ Iηλ ουτοι Iηλ ουδ οτι 7
 55 εισιν σ[περμα Αβρααμ παντες τεκνα αλλ εν Ισαακ
 κληθησ[ε]ται σοι σπερμα τουτ εστιν ου τα τεκνα της 8
 σαρκος ταυτα τεκνα του θυ αλλα τα τεκνα της επαγγε
 λιας λογιζεται εις σπερμα επαγγελιας γαρ ο λογος 9
 ουτος [κατα τον καιρον τουτον ελευσομαι και
 60 εσ[ται]

3. του σω[ματος]: so B²ACKL &c.; της σαρκος DEFG.

7. It is quite unlikely that ωστε, which in DE precedes αυτο, stood in the papyrus.

14. του: om. FG.

16. [ε]π: so AB³CD^cEKL &c.; εφ B²S^cCD*FG.

17. What was originally written in place of the ordinary reading ελευθερωθησεται απο is not clear; no variant is recorded. Perhaps the first hand wrote ηλευθερωθη εκ; the corrector substituted ελευθερουται απο. At the beginning of the line it is improbable that διοτι (S^cD*FG) was read, the supplement being already of ample length.

19. γαρ: δε A.

25. The lacuna is of approximately the same length as those of the three following lines, and it is therefore hardly possible, even with allowance for the large number of iotas, that τι και followed τις as in S^cACKL &c. The most suitable reading is that of B (so Westcott-Hort); B²DFG have τις τι, S^c* τις και. On the same ground ελπίζει (B²S^cCD^cFGKL &c.) is preferable to υπομενει (S^c*A).

30. There would clearly be no room for the addition of υπερ ημων (S^cCKL &c.) before στεναγμοις.

32. It is practically certain that εκ νεκρων (S^c*AC) did not follow εγερθεις. With regard to the omission of I(ησου)ς (so BDEK) and the addition of και before αποθανων (so DEFGKL), the space gives no evident indications.

33. κα[ι]: so B²S^cDEFGKL; om. S^c*AC.

34. The supplement here is rather shorter than in the adjacent lines, and perhaps ουν was read after τις with FG.

39. του αγα[πησαντος]: so B²ACKL; του αγαπησαντα DEFG.

40. In DE ουτε εξουσια precedes ουτε αρχαι, in C ουτε εξουσιαι follows; the papyrus

evidently had neither of these readings. It is equally certain that *ουτε δυναμεις* followed *μελλοντα*, not *αρχαι* as in KL.

42. *τις* may well have been omitted, as in DEFG.

44. [τ]ω κ(υρι)ω: του κυριου ACFG. The papyrus possibly read I(ησο)υ after X(ριστ)ω with D*EFG.

47-8. *αναθεμα ειναι αυ]τος εγω: αυτ. εγω αναθ. ειν.* CKL.

48. *απο:* so B²ACFKL &c.; *υπο* DEG. *μου*, which is omitted after *αδελφων* by D*FG, is required to fill the space.

49. *των κατα* DEFG.

54. *ουτοι* I(σρα)ηλιται with DEFG is not impossible.

56. The space would admit of *οτι ου* (B^cB²).

57. *του* may have been omitted before *θ(εο)υ*, as in FG.

1356. PHILO.

Fol. 4 16 × 15.5 cm.

Third century.

The following fragments are from the papyrus codex of Philo of which the pieces identified as belonging to extant treatises were printed under 1173. Apparently the codex contained other treatises which have not come down to us; at any rate we have not succeeded in identifying several fragments, though it is likely enough that of the smaller pieces at least the place will be found among Philo's existing works.

A palaeographical description of the papyrus was given in the introduction to 1173; the numeration of the leaves below is adapted to that of the leaves previously published. Fol. 4, the most considerable of the new fragments, is the left-hand leaf of a sheet of which Fol. 5, from near the beginning of the *De Ebrietate*, is the right-hand portion. Between the latter and Fol. 4, as the pagination shows, 5 sheets, i. e. 20 pages, intervened. The leaf is damaged in places, and in the recto it is difficult to obtain connected sense. Apparently the main subject is punishment, which is also under discussion on the verso, where interpretation is easier. The story of Croesus is cited in illustration of the doctrine that penalties are paid sooner or later, either in this world or the next, where disguise will be stripped off and the soul will be seen as it really is. Of Fol. 8, which belongs to the same sheet as Fol. 7, containing some of the final sections of the *De Ebrietate*, only beginnings and ends of lines remain. Since the pagination numbers are lost, there is no external indication as to whether the leaf preceded or followed Fol. 7. It is written in the more formal though perhaps not really different hand of Fols. 2-3, which come from the middle part of the *Quod Deterius Potiori insidiatur*. But the fragment is not to be found in the

preceding portion of that treatise, nor apparently in the *De Ebrietate*. Fol. 10 is not connected with any of the fragments previously published. It is broken both at the side and the bottom, but the damage is less severe than in Fol. 8. There is an agricultural simile on the recto, ll. 6-10, and the verso is concerned with prayer. Of Fol. 11, another independent leaf, only a small corner from the top remains. Frs. 1 and 2 are in the hand of Fols. 1, 4-7, 10-11; Fr. 3 is in that of Fol. 9, from the *De Mercede Meretricis*, but belongs to some other treatise.

Fol. 4 recto.

ρϕβ

τες της ψυχης την περι . . ανω .
 επιμελειας και προστασιας το[.]ε[.] . αν
 θ[ρ]ωπινων πραγματος αμ .
 εν αρεταις καλλιστευουσης οσι .
 5 σιν οις δεοντως αν ειποιμεν τε . μι
 κροψυχια την θεου μεγαλονοιαν παραμ[ε]τρι
 τε η ουκ εισθ οτι ημεις [[μ]] παθημ[α]σι μον[ο]ις
 ελαννομεθα και παραθηγομεθα πρ[ο]ς α[φ]ρονας
 επεξοδους αναγκαζομενοι ποιεισθαι [.]τω . [.] .
 10 τε αναγιω και αποφω προσεστιν λογισμω
 γαρ μονω χρηται κυβερνητη τους αρμοττον
 τας εκαστοις καιρους περιαρθρειν . . ς ανδρε[ς]
 φιλοσοφια συμβιουν επιμορφαζο[ν]
 τεξ . . υνδ[.] . ε . . γυναικος γ . ητριδος συγ . [.]
 15 φους ευβουλια [τους] περι θεων ηττωμεν[ους]
 φησι [γ]αρ θεοι δ[.] νεσω . [.] τικαδαη[.]
 ε . . . ηλ[.] . ηλα[.]
 . [.] [25 letters
 [.] . . [28 ,,
 20 [.] 30 ,, κα
 . . [.] 25 ,,
 [.] 25 ,,

Fol. 4 verso.

P4Y

[. .]τη[. . . .] τους νομους θελει ουκ ευκαταφρονη
 25 τ[ο]ς ο[υν] δοκ[η]θεντι Κροισω των καθ εαυτον απ̄
 τ[ων] γενομε[ν]ων ευδαιμονεστατω ειναι καθα
 φα[σιν] εκ το[υ] Δελφικου τριποδος ενθουσιων ο α
 λ[η]θη[ς] μ[αν]τις προυθεσπισεν τελος οραν μακρου
 β[ιο]υ τ[ων] γαρ αδικων ατειμωρητος ουδεις προς
 30 α[λ]ηθεια[ν] αφειεται δικας δε τας αρμοππουσας
 διδωσιν ε[ι] και μη ευθυς αλλ οψε γουν ως οιονται
 τινες οψε γαρ ουδεν των εν τη φυσει βραβευου
 σι παν[τ]α δε εν καιρω διδωσι μεντοι και ει μη ενται
 θα και παρ ημειν αλλ εναυτε παρα δικα[σ]ταις
 35 [κ]ρειττοσι λελυμενοις των σωματος δεσμ̄
 [ο τ]α παθη και τας κακιας εξωπυρει και ενεφλε
 [γ]εν εξ εαυτου ψυχαις γαρ ψυχας δικαζοντες γυ
 μνας ολας δι ολων κατανοουσι ειλικρινως ου
 [δ] αυθ υπο των περιαπτων [. . .]γ κατειλημπτο
 40 [πρ]οτερον απ[. .]μενοι . [. .] . εν τινι σ̄υν λο
 [. . .]αρα . [.]υς εσ̄ω ε . [. . . .
 [25 letters] . ο . [. .] . [. .]πω
 [30 „] α[πο]κρι
 [32 „]ασι
 45 [33 „]ατρ[.]
 [27 „] . [.]γε . τυρ̄α
 [ν 24 „]μα γυμναζων

Fol. 8.

Verso.

ακουειν εγνω η[
 το αντι θ̄υ [. .]υν[αν
 θρωπους [
 μεναδ[
 5 ακρατα μ . [

Recto.

]γοπ[ο]ιοι δ ουδεν
 25]εσαι ογτων
 ε]μπνευθε
] . . . ζ και
] . δε εξ αποστο

	ας επει[]τομεν
	ρειτεφ[30	η]μιν
	πανι[τ]ων ολων
	προ τοσ . []ντες δω
10	αλλα πρ . [] . . σα .
	about 9 lines lost.	34] . ειυ[.
20	λ[. . .] . [about 8 lines lost.
	ετερους [πα]νουργον
	σ . [45] . [.]νους
	. . []
].
]ν

Fol. 10 recto.

εμπειρο[
 ευχεται τι[
 αναδιδαχθ[
 νος η πηδαλ[ιουχων(?)
 5 ἴσως δ ουδε π . [
 ερριζωμενος [
 τρον π . . [
 μηδε γυρευσαι φυτον [
 απο πηγης αποχετευσαι μ[
 10 μαι τον αρδο η ταυτ[
 ουχ Ελλην μονον αλλα κα[ι βαρβαρος
 μενα μαρτυς δε και α[
 φων προς Καμβησην . [
 > ειποντα [. . .] . . . [
 15 . [. .]ων ο[

Fol. 10 verso.

] λογισμου
]σθαι κατα
]α και αθροα

πα]ρεστῶσαι τη
 20] ευχαις αποτει
] ουκ επισταμε
]ν αρετης θυ μελε
] τελουσι τας ευχας ιστω
] πρεπον ευσεβε[ι]α κοσμον οι
 25]ζοντες παρατηρητεον. δε
]λεστερων μηδ οσα δυνατοι
]εν ευχεσθαι δει γαρ τας θυ
] διδοντος μαλλον η αδξι
 μ]ετρεισθαι παρ ο και δημο
 30 [σι] τον υπερ' τη

Fol. 11.

Recto.

σωφροσυνη[
 κατασκευ[α ει
 ρηνην θε[
 τ[

Verso.

5]ν εφειεται η
]γουσαι ου εχω
]ον
]της υπο κ[. .]
]σ

Fr. 1.

Recto.

]νισαφρ αβ . . . [
] . κλοπαις και αρπαγ[αις

Verso.

]ατ[
]αι φ[
 5]ι αλ[
]ιπετο[
]ενυμ[

Fr. 2.

Recto.

φυσις α[

Verso.

5] . οδ[. .]αι

τωσε[ε]στιν αλλο
ε]ιν·
δησα[]· τι δυ
καθ' ε[]· [·]· [··
· · ·	· · · ·

Fr. 3.

Recto.	Verso.
· · · ·	· · · ·
] αλλω[]ασον[
]ει και· []· εται δ[
]δ[·]· [] γνησιον[
] ειπων ο[]ανοησας [
5]εντα· δογ· [15]ων ζων[τ
]αι τω ^ι του[]ιοχος τε[
]· αι δε τα[]κτως φ· [
]αυται[]· ατε· κα[
[]] προσ[
10]οστ[20]ανε[
· · · ·]· [
	· · · ·

Fol. 4. 1. The letter after *περι* may be *π*, but *πλ* is unsatisfactory and a substantive is rather expected. *περιτιτανωσ[ι]* is possible (cf. Hesych. (τε)τιτανωμένας γεγυψωμένας).

5. *s* of *οις* has been corrected; apparently the scribe began to write *δ*. Both *τη* and *τι* seem to be inadmissible after *ειπομεν*.

6. *θεου*: for the absence of contraction cf. ll. 15 and 16. Elsewhere in this MS. the contracted form is used.

9. *ἐπέξοδος* in the sense of punishment is common in Egyptian documents, but hardly to be found elsewhere except in Philo (Mangey, i, p. 283. 12, ii, p. 314. 1, p. 525. 24). At the end of the line]των[would suit the remains, but the construction is obscure.

10. *αποφω* after *αναγιω* looks like a corruption of *ανοσιω*. *τε* is perhaps displaced.

12. *περιαρθρειν* is presumably for *περιαθρειν*, which occurs in Philo *ap.* Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* pp. 387 c, 393 a (Mangey, ii, p. 636. 1, p. 641. 23); Philo also uses *περιάθρησις*. The next word is possibly *ωσ*.

13. The vestiges are consistent with *συμ φιλ.*, though the *υ* is too far from the *μ*. *επιμορφαζειν* occurs repeatedly in Philo, with the infin., as here, in i, p. 387. 30, ii, p. 551. 18 Mangey, and with other constructions elsewhere.

14. *νν δ[ε]* *περι* is a possible reading, but the *π* would be unsatisfactory and the passage apparently devoid of construction. The *ἄνδρες* would rather be expected to be brought into some relation with the *γυνή*. *γοητριδος*, if that is the word intended, is intelligible though

a novel form. Below the interlinear *o* a correction has been made, but what was originally written (? *ν*) and the purport of the alteration are not clear. At the end of the line *συγ.* [or *συνπ*] seems inevitable.

23. Apparently not *εκουτ*.

24-38. 'Let not then the truthful seer be despised who, when Croesus was supposed to be the happiest of all the men of his time, so the story goes, warned him under inspiration from the Delphic tripod to regard the end of a long life. For in truth no unjust person is allowed to go unpunished; but he pays the fitting penalty, if not at once, then late at any rate, as some think, although nothing in nature is determined late, but everything in due season. However, he pays it, if not here and among us, then in Hades, with better judges, who are freed from the chains of the body which of itself kindled and inflamed passions and vice; for judging with their souls naked souls they see them distinctly through and through.'

24. Some ink marks in the margin above *ουκ* are probably accidental.

25. *τ[ο]ς* suits the space better than *τ[ω]ς*, and *δοκ]ηθεντι* perhaps better than *οι]ηθεντι*. Croesus is referred to by Philo also in ii, p. 60. 13 and p. 468. 116 Mangey.

26. *ανθρω]πων* is inadmissible.

27-9. According to the well-known story in Hdt. i. 32 the warning *τέλος ὄραν* was given to Croesus by Solon; cf. Diogen. viii. 51 *τέλος ὄρα βίου* (*μακροβίου* cod. Pant.; cf. *μακρον βίου* here) *τοῦτο τὸ ἀπόφθεγμα Σόλων εἶπε Κροίσω*. In l. 27 *φα[σιν]* is extremely doubtful.

31-2. *οψε κτλ.*; cf. e. g. Eurip. Fr. 224 *Δίκα τοι δίκαι χροόνιος, ἀλλ' ὅμως ὑποπεσοῦς' ἔλαθεν, ὅταν ἔχη τιν' ἀσεβῆ βροτῶν*, Fr. 969 *ἡ Δίκη . . . σίγα καὶ βραδεί ποδὶ στείχουσα μάρπτει τοὺς κακοὺς αἰὲ βροτῶν*. *βραβενουσι* has no definite subject and is perhaps an error for *βραβευεται*.

34. *εναουτε*: l. *εν Α(ι)δου γε*. For other uncorrected corruptions in this text cf. e. g. Fol. 7 recto. 21 *και ανθωσ[ω]* for *χλιανθ*. and Fol. 10. 8-10 below.

39. *περιαπτων*: cf. e. g. Philo i, p. 288. 6 Mangey *ἀπαμφιασάμενοι τὰ περιάπτα γυμνήν ἐπιδείκνυνται τὴν ὑπόκρισιν*. [*υφ ω]ν* might well be restored in the following lacuna, but there then seems to be no subject for the verb unless *κατειλημπτο* was regarded as plural.

40. *συν*: apparently not *ουν*.

Fol. 8. 9. The doubtful *σ* is possibly *ι*; the next letter has a vertical stroke and is not *α* nor *ο*.

24.]*γοπ[ο]ιοι*: the first letter may be *τ*, and *γ[ο]ν* could be read in place of *π[ο]ι*.

25.]*εναι*: or *ε[ι]ναι*.

33. The vestige after *σα* may be a medial stop.

Fol. 10. 4. *πηδαλιούχος* and *πηδαλιουχείν* are Philonian words, e. g. i, p. 145. 33, p. 131. 43 Mangey.

8. *γυρεσαι* is a *vox nihili*; was *φυτεῦσαι* meant? The *ε* has been corrected, perhaps from *α*.

9. *ἀποχέτευσις* is used by Philo (Mangey, i, p. 29), but apparently not the verb.

10. A blank space is left after *αρδο*, the archetype being presumably illegible or defective. *αρδοντα* would be in keeping with the context.

13. *προ σκαμβης* is unattractive here, and we prefer to suppose that *καμβησην* was written for *Καμβυσην*; both *μαρτυς δε* in l. 12 and *ειποντα* in l. 14 are in favour of a proper name.

14. For the use of the diplê in a prose papyrus cf. 1241. v. 5, 24, vi. 25, P. Hawara 15 in *Archiv* v, p. 378. A similar sign is employed in 405 to mark a quotation, and possibly this is the meaning of the sign here.

28. l. *αξι*.

30. The reason for the comma-shaped mark after *υπερ* is not evident. Such marks are not infrequently inserted at this period between doubled consonants, but would not be expected between *υπερ* and *την*, and there is no parallel elsewhere in 1173 or 1356.

Fol. 11. 6. The first letter may be either γ or τ , and *ου εχω* may be *ους χω*.

Fr. 2. 1. The *a* has been rewritten.

7. ν is made with a very long diagonal stroke in order to fill up the line.

Fr. 3. 5. The supposed stop may be the top of an *ι*.

11. The spacing suggests that the division was]*as ov*].

1357. CALENDAR OF CHURCH SERVICES AT OXYRHYNCHUS.

29.6 × 36.4 cm. A. D. 535-6. Plate I (Col. i).

This unique papyrus, one of the most interesting documents concerning the early Egyptian Church that has been discovered, contains a list of *συνάξεις* at various churches on Sundays, festivals, and (apparently) other days through a period of five months in a year which was the 14th of an indiction-series. *σύναξις* (*conventus* or *collecta*), a term applied by Cyril Hierosol. and Chrysostom to Christian congregations in general, is used by Dionysius the Areopagite (fourth or fifth century?) with especial reference to the celebration of the Eucharist; and, though his explanation of the origin of the term (*De eccl. hier.* i. 3) is incorrect, Socrates, who discusses *συνάξεις* and states that at Alexandria on Wednesdays and Fridays the scriptures were read and expounded, *πάντα τε τὰ συνάξεως γίνεται δίχα τῆς τῶν μυστηρίων τελετῆς* (*Hist.* v. 22), shows that in the fifth century *σύναξις* was used for a service which generally included the celebration of the Eucharist. The word passed into Coptic, e.g. Hyvernat, *Actes des Martyrs*, i, p. 249 'un jour qu'ils faisaient la sainte *σύναξις* dans le τόπος des saints apôtres Pierre et Paul, au jour de leur commémoration qui est le cinquième d'Épip' (cf. p. 29), and continues in the calendar of the Greek Church with reference to services on certain important occasions, e.g. ἡ *σύναξις* τῆς Θεοτόκου on Dec. 26. Nilles (*Kalend. utriusque eccl.* i, p. 53 and ii, pp. 61-4) notes, as others have done, the resemblance to the Latin *stationes* or processions on fixed days to particular churches at Rome, especially in Lent or on festivals, when from before the times of the Gregorian Sacramentary (eighth century according to Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, ed. 4, p. 124) the Pope participated in the service and addressed the people—a duty which since 1870 is performed by a cardinal as his deputy. The parallelism between this list of *συνάξεις* and the Roman *stationes* is indeed curiously close, as was observed by the Rev. F. E. Brightman, to whom and to Mr. W. E. Crum we are indebted for valuable assistance in the interpretation of this papyrus (II).

The text is in two columns, containing 32 and 36 or 37 lines respectively, of which the first has lost six lines in the middle but is otherwise complete, while the second is broken vertically down the middle, so that the details concerning festivals are lost, and there are also gaps affecting the numbers of the days and names of churches. The lines are closer together towards the end of Col. ii, of which the margin at the bottom is broken but was in any case much narrower than in Col. i, as if the writer were cramped for space, and it is not likely that any columns are missing, though a fragment assigned to l. 56 might possibly come from a later column. The script is a rather large, somewhat irregular uncial, the size of λ, υ, and χ and letters at the end of a line being often exaggerated. It suggests a scribe who was familiar with drawing up liturgical documents, probably Coptic as well as Greek, but was not particularly well educated, as is also indicated by the character of the Greek, which is correctly spelled but employs some vulgar forms; cf. notes on ll. 1, 2, and 8.

Abbreviations are numerous, being indicated usually by a wavy line either above or after the last letter written; but the contraction of Χριστοῦ is avoided. Diaereses and paragraphi are used occasionally; cf. l. 56, note. The palaeographical evidence points to a date not earlier than about A. D. 450 nor later than about 550; but internal evidence fortunately enables the year to be fixed more precisely. Since several Sundays are recorded, the days of the week are known wherever the days of the month are preserved, so that e. g. Phaophi 23 (l. 3) was a Sunday. This day in an ordinary year corresponded to Oct. 20, but comes, like all the dates in Π as far as l. 62, within the six months' period from Aug. 29 to the end of Feb. during which owing to the difference of intercalation the days on the Egyptian calendar may fall one day later than usual in the Julian calendar. Hence Phaophi 23 in a Julian year next before a leap-year corresponds to Oct. 21. There happens to be no occasion in the fourth and fifth centuries on which Phaophi 23 of the 14th indiction falls on a Sunday, and of the two years in the sixth century which fulfil the prescribed conditions, 535 and 580, we have for palaeographical reasons little hesitation in preferring the earlier, which is in fact the only thoroughly suitable date, being confirmed by two pieces of internal evidence. In the first place the Nativity is recorded on Choiak 28, not 29, as is natural if the year was bissextile; cf. p. 28. Secondly Easter in 536 in Egypt fell on March 23 (Ideler, *Handb. d. Chronol.* ii, p. 263), a date which is quite in accordance with the indications in Π concerning the beginning of Lent (cf. p. 30), and of which the arrival would form a not unnatural point for the conclusion of the document. In 581 Easter fell on April 6, so that Lent began on Mecheir 30 (Feb. 24), and the year was not bissextile.

Π is thus shown to be concerned with the year 535-6, less than a century

after the Council of Chalcedon (451), which caused a schism in the Alexandrine Church, and to fall near the end of the patriarchate of Timotheus IV and of the period of compromise with the monophysites inaugurated by the Henoticon of the Emperor Zeno. Timotheus died in 536 and was succeeded by Theodosius, who was exiled by Justinian three years later, when the monophysite patriarchs of Alexandria were finally disowned by Constantinople and a permanent succession of rival catholic patriarchs began. The circumstance that Π belongs to the period of compromise accords well with the large number of churches mentioned, which had been greatly multiplied since the preceding century (cf. p. 26), and at most, but probably not all, of which the clergy were no doubt monophysites, as is perhaps also indicated by the exceptional prominence assigned to the festival of St. Philoxenus (ll. 24-7, note).

On the general character of early church festivals and calendars see Duchesne, *op. cit.* ch. viii. The earliest extant calendar of any of the Eastern Churches is a Syriac one, written in 411 and first published by Wright, and now by Nau in *Patrol. Orient.* x, pp. 11-23, which gives a list of festivals observed in Syria. Of the Latin Church the earliest calendars are the short Philocalian tables (336) referring to popes and martyrs buried at Rome, and the Martyrology attributed to St. Jerome, which is largely based on the same source as the Syriac calendar and in its present form is of the fifth century, a calendar of Tours (461-90), and another of Carthage (soon after 505). The oldest Byzantine calendars, that of Morcelli (eighth century?), that at Naples (ninth century?), and the Menologium of Basil (tenth century), are several centuries later than Π, which, as would be expected, differs considerably from them but agrees with the early Syriac martyrology with regard to the date of the commemoration of SS. Peter and Paul (cf. p. 29). Of the Coptic Church the earliest calendars are those published from menologia by Nau in *op. cit.* x, pp. 187-210 (thirteenth-fourteenth century), by Tisserand from Abul-Barakât in *op. cit.* x, pp. 252-78 (thirteenth century), Wüstenfeld's *Synaxarium* (fifteenth century; the second half of the year was never issued), and Basset's (from fourteenth and sixteenth century MSS.; *Patrol. Orient.* i, pp. 224 sqq. and iii, pp. 247 sqq., covering Thoth—Choiak only). For the modern calendar of the Eastern Churches see Nilles, *op. cit.* and Malan, *Calendar of the Coptic Church*. Π's list is naturally shorter than the mediaeval ones, and has many other points of difference.

The starting-point is not the beginning of the Egyptian civil year (Thoth 1 = Aug. 29) but Phaophi 23 (Oct. 21, not 20, in 535), this date being explained by the title (ll. 1-2), which states that the list refers to *συνάξεις* 'after the πάπας descended to Alexandria'. Πάπας was the ordinary title in Egypt of the Alexandrian patriarch, e. g. in P. Amh. 3 (a). iii. 5 (cf. Deissmann, *Licht vom*

Osten, p. 137), Brit. Mus. 113 (10). 12, but it is applied also to presbyters and even subordinate clergy, e. g. P. Brit. Mus. 417. 3 πάπας Ἐρμουπόλεως (a village in the Arsinoite nome; cf. Deissmann, *op. cit.* p. 150) and 1631. ix verso. 1. In P. Giessen 55. 2, as Mr. Crum remarks, π'π' means πρεσβύτερος, which is often thus abbreviated in Coptic papyri, not πάπας, as suggested by the editor. In 1357 the mention of Alexandria and the obvious importance of the πάπας in question make it much more likely that the patriarch is meant than a local bishop. Oxyrhynchus was the seat of a bishop, who in 534 was abba Petrus (P. S. I. 216. 4); but κατελθεῖν would be a more natural word to use in reference to the patriarch's return than to the departure of the bishop of Oxyrhynchus on a visit to Alexandria. Probably, therefore, Timotheus IV had come to Oxyrhynchus on his way back from a tour of inspection in Upper Egypt, and started homewards a day or two before Oct. 21. The calendar, which is too elaborately written to be a mere private memorandum and may have been publicly exhibited, must have been drawn up either on his departure, if it is a notice concerning forthcoming συνάξεις, or about Easter or later, if it is a record of συνάξεις actually held. It is not a complete list of days on which there were services, for few of the churches mentioned were visited more than two or three times in the five months, and just before the Epiphany a whole week (Dec. 31–Jan. 6) passes without a σύναξις in an interval between continuous συνάξεις from Dec. 19–28 and Jan. 7–13. That is the only case where a Sunday is certainly omitted in Π; but a regular use of all the churches mentioned, with Eucharistic services on Sundays and probably on important festivals, is quite compatible with the apparent claim of the writer in l. 1 to set forth a comprehensive list of συνάξεις, if that term is interpreted (cf. p. 19) in the light of the Roman *stationes* as special assemblies on Sundays and holy days at appropriate churches (if possible, the church of the saint whose day it was; cf. ll. 8, 10–11, and 24), at which the bishop of Oxyrhynchus was very likely present. At Rome the *stationes* are now 87, on 83 different days in a year, distributed among 44 churches (Nilles, *op. cit.* ii. 63); at Oxyrhynchus the συνάξεις in about five months from Oct. to March were 66, on about 62 different days, distributed among at least 26 different churches, so that in a year the whole number of συνάξεις may have exceeded 130, and of churches 40. The days at Rome on which two or more *stationes* are held on the same day are Christmas Day and the Thursday following the Fourth Sunday in Lent; at Oxyrhynchus two συνάξεις took place on Tubi 1 (the day of St. Peter and St. Paul), 14, 15 and very likely on a day early in Mecheir (l. 50), possibly others. The use of εἰς in e. g. εἰς τὴν ἁγί(αν) Μαρίαν (l. 30) to indicate her church is exactly parallel to the use of *ad* in the Roman liturgy in connexion with the *stationes*, e. g. *ad S. Paulum extra muros*; the name of a saint standing for his church is

already common in sixth-century documents, e.g. 141. 3 (p. 25) and P. Stud. Pal. x. 35 (p. 24). That the calendar was an official one, drawn up by some presbyter or deacon or other assistant of the bishop of Oxyrhynchus, for the use either of the clergy whose duty it was to attend *συνάξεις* or of the public, is the most probable explanation of the care expended on its production.

Oxyrhynchus is not actually mentioned, but apart from the provenance of the papyrus and the correspondence between the saints invoked in 1151. 40-50, a Christian amulet of the fifth(?) century, and the names of several churches mentioned in Π, the fact that Oxyrhynchus was the town in question is proved by the occurrence of at least four known names of Oxyrhynchite churches. Thus the *νοτινὴ ἐκκλησία* in ll. 37 and 61 is doubtless identical with the church of that name in a list of guards stationed at the chief buildings of the town about A. D. 300 (43 verso. iii. 20). The continued survival of this church through the period of persecution before Constantine is the more interesting because its existence in the reign of Diocletian had been questioned by Wilamowitz, who (*Gött. gel. Anz.* 1898, p. 676) wished to regard *ἐκκλησία* in 43 as a place of assembly. The *βορρινὴ ἐκκλησία* mentioned in 43 verso. i. 10 perhaps occurs in l. 50, which can be restored *εἰς τὸ β[ορρινὸν μαρτύριον. ἐκκλησία* and *μαρτύριον* are sometimes treated as synonymous at this period, as is indicated by e.g. 941. 3 *οἰκονόμου τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰούστου . . . ἀντὶς τοῦ μαρτύριου* and 1311 *Ἀνιανὸς πρ(εσβύτερος) μαρτυρ(ίου) ἅπα Ἰούστου*, this *μαρτύριον* being no doubt the same as the church of St. Justus in l. 10 of Π; cf. 1151. 50 and p. 27. The *ἄμφοδον ἁγίας Εὐφημίας* at Oxyrhynchus known from 1038. 23 is moreover to be connected with the church of that saint (cf. l. 41, note), and the *οἰκ(ονόμος) τοῦ ἁγίου Γαβριήλ* in 993 with the church named in l. 54.

Except in the case of the 'Southern church' and possibly the 'Northern martyrion', *ἐκκλησία* and *μαρτύριον* do not occur in Π, but *ἐκκλησίαν* has to be supplied with *τήν* before *μαρτύρ(ων)* (l. 5), *Φοιβάμμωνος* (e.g. l. 3), *Ἀννιανῆς* (ll. 21 and 44), and *ἅμα* [*Ἡραίδος* (l. 40)]. On the church 'of the Martyrs' see l. 5, note. Phoebammon is presumably identical with the saint of that name (*Amélineau, Les actes des martyrs*, pp. 54-9), whose day in later times (but not in Π; cf. ll. 46-8) was Tubi 27, and who is well known from many Theban and other Coptic texts (cf. e.g. Crum, *Coptic Ostraca*, p. xii) and Christian inscriptions (e.g. that quoted in l. 20, note), besides B. G. U. 694 (Arsinoë, seventh-eighth century), P. Brit. Mus. 1430, &c. (church or monastery at Aphrodito, eighth century), P. Stud. Pal. x. 35 (sixth or seventh century). Of the last-mentioned papyrus, which is a list of *ὄψα* supplied to various churches and monasteries at an unnamed town, we append the text with some additional restorations:

+ Θεοδώρω	[εἰς τὸν ἅγιον Φιλόξενο[ν . . .
(ὑπὲρ) βρεοῦλου ὄψω[ν . . .		εἰς τὸ μοναστήριον τῶν [. . .
καρπῶν πέμπτ[ης ἰνδικτίονος		τῶν παρθενευουσῶν [. . .
εἰς τὸ μοναστήριον τῶν [. . .		ἄββᾶ Μαρκέλλο[ν . . .
5 εἰς τὸν ἅγιον Φοιβάμμ[ωνα . . .		15 Ἀβρααμίου [. . .
εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν Εὐφημί[αν . . .		εὐχαριστῶ . . . [. . .
εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν ἄμα Ἡρ[αίν . . .		πτ[. . .
εἰς τὸν ἀρχάγγελον [Μιχαήλ (Γαβριήλ ?)		[. . .] φαρ[. . .
εἰς τὸν ἅγιον ἄββᾶ . . .		[Φιλ ?] ἵππου [. . .
10 εἰς τὸ μοναστήριον ἄβ[βᾶ Ἀνδρέου ?		20 πε . . . ε . [

The churches of SS. Phoebammon, Euphemia, and Philoxenus (ll. 5, 6, 11) correspond to the churches in ll. 3, 51, and 24 of Π; ἡ ἁγία ἄμα Ἡρ[αίς (so Crum in l. 7; Wessely reads Ἀμαη . []) may be identical with ἄμα [. . . in l. 40 of Π; the archangel (l. 8) is doubtless Μιχαήλ or Γαβριήλ (cf. ll. 8 and 54 of Π), and the ἅγιος ἄββᾶ . [. . . (l. 9) may well be the saint in l. 49 of Π, while the monastery in l. 10 can be that mentioned in 146. 1 and 147. 1. Whether ἄββᾶ Μαρκέλλου and Ἀβρααμίου (ll. 14-15) are names of churches or monasteries or of private persons is not clear; they do not occur in Π, but in view of the marked coincidences in ll. 5-11 with churches at Oxyrhynchus that town is in any case quite as likely to be the one concerned as Heracleopolis, to which Wessely doubtfully refers it. The ρ of ἄμα Ἡρ[αίν is uncertain, and in l. 40 of Π Ἀμα[ίου could be read (cf. B. G. U. 682. 1 = P. Klein. Form. 783 ἐνοικ(ίου) τοῦ ἁγίου Ἀμαιω, perhaps a mistake for Ἀμαίου, a name occurring in e. g. P. Klein. Form. 655. 3), or e. g. Ἀμα[ρανθίου, or Ἀμα[ντίου (a reputed martyr under Hadrian; cf. Ruinart, *Acta martyrum sincera*, p. 18). But ἄμα Ἡραίς is a well-known Coptic saint, whose day was Tubi 28 (Jan. 23); cf. Hyvernat, *Actes* i. 78 sqq. With regard to the two omissions of ἅγιος in Π, where P. Stud. Pal. x. 35. 5 and 7 insert it, scribes are often inconsistent in the employment of that term (cf. e. g. 146. 1 with 147. 1); but the uniform use in Π of the accusative, not the genitive with τήν, in the names of ἅγιοι suggests that the absence of the term where Phoebammon, Anniane, and ama Heraïs are mentioned was no mere accident, and in the cases of Epimachus and Ision also, whose days are recorded (cf. pp. 26-7), the omission may well have had a real significance. Probably none of these persons had yet been officially recognized as saints: that churches in Egypt were sometimes called after persons who were apparently not yet technically ἅγιοι was already attested, e. g. at Oxyrhynchus (1053. 23 ἐκκλησία ἄββᾶ Ἱερακίωνος, later a Coptic saint; cf. l. 46, note), Aphrodito (P. Brit. Mus. 1419. 524 ἐκκλ(ησία) Ἑρμείου), Arsinoë (ἐκκλησία

Ἰσίωνος, cf. p. 27), and Alexandria, where the church of St. Michael was generally known as Alexander's after its founder, the patriarch from 313 to 326, and the church of Theonas was also called after its founder (Cabrol, *Dict. de l'archéol. chrét.* i, pp. 1110 sqq.). Whether the churches of Phoebammon and the two others were so called because they too were the founders is very doubtful. Phoebammon is not known to have been connected with Oxyrhynchus, and though he and ama Heraïs must have been officially recognized as saints soon after the date of Π, they have not survived in the modern Coptic calendar. Anniane may be identical with the Ἀνιανή who gave her name to a Memphite village in P. Stud. Pal. x. 297 verso. i. 6; but we have failed to trace her elsewhere. Her name recalls that of Anianus (Annianus is probably less correct), the second patriarch of Alexandria, and possibly she was his sister; but there is a difference of several weeks between his day in the Coptic calendars (Hathur 20, which comes in the period covered by the lacuna in ll. 14-19) and the services at Anniane's church on Choiak 12 and Tubi 17. That St. Anne, the mother of the Virgin, is meant is unlikely; cf. l. 21, note. Phoebammon is a common name, and if he and ama [. . .] were different from SS. Phoebammon and ama Heraïs, both they and Anniane might be explained as the founders or even owners of churches. Since monasteries seem to have been sometimes called after private owners, this may have happened in the case of churches too. But it is more likely that they were martyrs or other holy persons venerated at Oxyrhynchus, though on a lower level of sanctity than e.g. St. Menas and St. Victor. They were thus in the same rank as Epimachus and Ision, of whom the former is obviously identical with St. Epimachus in the Coptic calendars, while the latter had a church at Arsinoë in the seventh or eighth century (P. Klein. Form. 299 ἐκκλησία Ἰσίωνος, this Ision being apparently identical with the ἅπα Ἰσίων whose monasteries are mentioned in *op. cit.* 603); cf. pp. 26-7.

Other churches mentioned in 1357 include nine which were called after the principal saints, St. Mary (l. 30), the archangels Michael (l. 8) and Gabriel (l. 54), SS. Peter (l. 33) and Paul (l. 34?), the prophets Jeremiah (l. 46) and Zachariah (l. 52, note; which Zachariah is meant is uncertain), 'the Baptist' (l. 47), and 'the Evangelist' (l. 23). The selection of one particular evangelist as distinct from the others is somewhat remarkable. At first sight St. Mark, the founder of the See of Alexandria, might seem to be indicated, but St. John is probably meant for several reasons: (1) he is the only evangelist mentioned in 1151, and all the other saints there named (the Virgin and archangels, SS. Serenus, Philoxenus, Victor, and Justus) had churches in Π's list; (2) 141. 3 θυρορ(ῶ) τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου implies that St. John was the patron saint of a church or monastery at Oxyrhynchus; (3) there is apparently a contrast intended between (St. John) 'the Baptist' and

'the Evangelist', which goes far to explain the omission of the name in both cases. The remaining churches were called after various lesser saints (chiefly Egyptian martyrs), of whom SS. Cosmas (l. 22), Euphemia (l. 51), Julianus or Julius (l. 48), Justus (l. 10), Menas (l. 11), apa Noup (l. 56), Theodorus (l. 65), Theodotus (l. 63?), and Victor (l. 20) are still commemorated by the Coptic Church, but not SS. Philoxenus (l. 24) and Serenus (l. 4). In ten instances the names are lost, but l. 49 may well refer to the known church of abba Hieracion (l. 46, note). The churches most frequently visited on the occasions of *συνάξεις* were those of Phoebammon (8 *συν.*), SS. Philoxenus (7 or 8, including 4 in connexion with his festival), Mary (4 or 5, including 3 at Christmas), and Serenus (4); at the Evangelist's, St. Michael's, and the Southern church 3 *συνάξεις* were held, at the others 2 or 1. According to Rufinus, who visited Oxyrhynchus early in the fifth century, the city contained 12 churches *in quibus publicus agitur populi conventus* (i.e. *σύναξις*) *exceptis monasteriis in quibus per singula orationum domus sunt* (*Hist. Mon.* v), and he was informed by the bishop of Oxyrhynchus that there were as many as 10,000 monks and 20,000 nuns. These numbers are probably exaggerated, but Rufinus' glowing account of the town's piety is corroborated by the large increase in the number of the churches, which in A.D. 535 probably amounted to 40 or more (cf. p. 21). Oxyrhynchus must have been an important Christian centre, and the disappearance of its numerous churches and monasteries is much to be regretted. Relics of them may be seen in some pillars in the chief mosque of Behnesa, and a single Corinthian column which marks the modern Coptic cemetery in the desert to the south-west of the town ruins.

Besides the list of churches II provides some valuable information concerning the various festivals and other days on which *συνάξεις* took place. Phaophi 25 (Oct. 22) was a 'day of repentance', a novel expression. A *μοναστήριον τῆς μετανοίας* at Alexandria is known from P. Flor. 298. 54, and the word is used in the Greek and Coptic Churches for 'obeisance' (Nilles, *op. cit.* i, p. lxiv). The date is too far removed from Christmas to be connected with Advent, which, moreover, does not seem to have taken its place among Western Church seasons before the latter part of the sixth century, while in the East the *κυριακὴ τῆς δευτέρας παρουσίας* is the Western Sexagesima, and the observance of the *τεσσαρακοστὴ τοῦ ἁγίου Φιλίππου* from Nov. 14 (his day, which may have come in l. 14; cf. p. 28) to Dec. 24 cannot be traced back earlier than 806, when it was enjoined upon monks by Nicephorus, patriarch of Constantinople. Hathur 3 (Oct. 30) was the 'day of Epimachus', i.e. St. Epimachus, a martyr under Maximian, commemorated in the Menol. Basil. and by the Coptic Church of the thirteenth–fourteenth centuries on the same day (Nau, *op. cit.* p. 192, Tisserand, p. 258), but since the fifteenth

century (cf. Wüstenfeld, *op. cit.*, Hathur 4) on the day following. The omission of *ἁγίου* before his name may well be explained, as in the case of Phoebammon and others (cf. p. 24), by supposing that he was not yet formally acknowledged as a saint; but it is not clear that *ἁγίου* was anywhere inserted in connexion with the days of particular persons, and the omission may be due merely to desire for brevity. Ision, however, whose day was Choiak 15 (Dec. 11), is not called *ἅγιος* in the two papyri referring to his church and monasteries at Arsinoë (cf. p. 25), from which alone he was known previously, so that with both him and Epimachus the omission is likely to be significant, especially since Ision, unlike Epimachus, is absent from the mediaeval and modern Coptic calendars. Neither of these two was commemorated in a church called after himself, and that such did not exist is clear from the contrast with the festivals of SS. Michael (ll. 8-9, Hathur 12-13 = Nov. 8-9), Justus (l. 10, Hathur 14 = Nov. 10), Menas (l. 11, Hathur 15-16 = Nov. 11-12), and Philoxenus (ll. 24-7, Choiak 22-5 = Dec. 18-21), which were celebrated by *συνάξεις* in their own churches (cf. p. 19). The archangel Michael's and St. Menas' days (the first of the successive *συνάξεις*) coincide with their dates in the mediaeval and modern Coptic and Greek calendars (a *σύναξις* of the archangel in the Greek; cf. p. 19); but St. Philoxenus' day, in Egypt at any rate, was not known previously; cf. ll. 24-7, note.

The date of St. Justus' day creates a difficulty. The mediaeval and modern Coptic calendars mention apparently five saints of that name, and Hathur 14 (Nov. 10) seems to correspond to a commemoration on Hathur 16 of Justus, a soldier martyred at Rome (fourth century?); in that case he is different from (1) St. Justus the patriarch now honoured on both Phamenoth 16 (March 12) and Pauni 12 (June 6), (2) the Justus whose *Acts* are extant (cf. Amélineau, *Les actes des martyrs*, p. 177), a martyr at Antinoë, honoured in the mediaeval calendars on Mecheir 9, (3) the companion martyr of St. Apollo (Mesore 1), and (4) the son of the Emperor Numerianus (Mecheir 11, but Mecheir 10 in the thirteenth century); but the Justus Martyr mentioned on July 14 in the Menol. Basil., and on Oct. 2 in Morcelli's calendar, is perhaps identical with the soldier Justus. He is not found, however, in the mediaeval Coptic calendars, and the *μαρτύριον ἅπα Ἰούστου* at Oxyrhynchus, as the church is apparently called elsewhere (cf. p. 23), would better suit the martyr of Antinoë. Hence we are disposed to think that the latter may be meant in l. 10, in spite of the divergence from the mediaeval date of his festival. For a service at his church three days later (l. 13) and one at St. Victor's on Choiak 7 (Dec. 3, l. 20), as well as for a service at St. Serenus' on Choiak 27 (Dec. 23, l. 29), no explanation is given, and the reason for the choice of these days is obscure. The *σύναξις* on Hathur 17 might be connected with the Alexandrine custom in the fifth century (cf. p. 19) of holding *συνάξεις* on

Wednesdays. But the other two days are Tuesday and Monday, and the *συνάξεις* in Π certainly depend mainly on saints' days, until Lent at any rate, when Saturdays predominate to the apparent exclusion of other week-days (cf. p. 30). Wednesdays are indeed until l. 56 more frequent in Π than any other week-day (7 *συνάξεις*, the next being Tuesday and Thursday with 5), but this seems to be accidental. The practice in Π apart from Lent is hardly in accordance with Socrates' statements (*Hist.* v. 22) concerning the importance of Saturdays as a day for *συνάξεις* in Egypt outside Alexandria.

In the lacuna affecting ll. 14-19 references to the days of SS. Andrew the Apostle (Choiak 4 = Nov. 30), Philip the Apostle (Hathur 18 = Nov. 14), and Cosmas (Hathur 22 = Nov. 18) may be lost; cf. notes on ll. 14-19 and 22. The observance of the Nativity (l. 30) by *συνάξεις* on three days (Choiak 28-30 = Dec. 25-7, not 24-6, in 535) does not seem to coincide with the three days' festival from Dec. 24-6 in the modern Coptic calendar. The mention of the Nativity occurs on Choiak 28, not 29 which is ordinarily Christmas Day, a circumstance which is best explained in accordance with the mediaeval Coptic synaxarium for Choiak 29 (Basset, *op. cit.* iii, p. 537) '*en effet elle (la naissance) eut lieu à la fin du 28 de Kihak et le 29^e jour, et aussi, parce que dans les années bissextiles la nativité tombe le 28 de Kihak et dans les années non bissextiles le 29, ils (les Pères de l'Église) ont voulu que les deux jours fussent consacrés par honneur à cette sainte fête.*' An early observance of Christmas Eve is less likely, for vigils (*παραμονή* is the word in the Greek Church) are very rare in early church calendars, and if Choiak 28 was Christmas Eve the mention of the Nativity ought to have occurred in the next line. Christmas Day had about a century before the date of Π (cf. Duchesne, *op. cit.* p. 259) been fixed on Dec. 25 in the Eastern Church, one branch of which, the Armenian, still combines it with the Epiphany on Jan. 6, and that the Egyptian Church in the sixth century observed the Byzantine (i. e. Roman) date of Christmas irrespective of the peculiarities of the Egyptian calendar is in the case of so important a festival not a surprising exception to the rule governing saints' days. In an ordinary year, in which Choiak 29 coincided with Dec. 25, there were probably only two *συνάξεις* connected with Christmas, since Tubi 1 was a day of other commemorations.

In Col. ii the notices of saints' days &c. are lost but can in several cases be restored. The festival of St. Stephen, which is older than the discovery of his tomb in 415 (Duchesne, *op. cit.* p. 267), would be expected to be mentioned, and either the first of the two *συνάξεις* in ll. 33-4 on Tubi 1 (Dec. 27) might refer to the *ἡμέρα (ἁγίου?) Στεφάνου*, who is honoured by the mediaeval and modern Coptic and Greek churches on that day, or the second *συνάξις* might be *εἰς τὸν ἁγιον*

[Στέφανον ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ. A church of St. Stephen at Arsinoë occurs in c. g. P. Stud. Pal. x. 75. 7. But in the East in early times, as is shown by the Syriac calendar of 411, the martyrdom of St. Stephen was celebrated on Dec. 26, that of SS. James and John, Apostles, on Dec. 27, and that of SS. Peter and Paul on Dec. 28, the first date being still observed in the Armenian Church, which inverts the order of the other two commemorations. Hence, since the service in l. 33 was at St. Peter's, that in l. 34 was probably at St. Paul's, and the absence of a *συνάξις* at this point in honour of St. Stephen, if not due to Christmas, may be accounted for by supposing that it took place on Thoth 15 (Sept. 12), when there was another commemoration of him in the Coptic calendars, or on Aug. 2, when he is mentioned in the Menol. Basil. In the mediaeval and modern Coptic calendars the day of St. Peter and St. Paul is Epeiph 5 (June 29), as also in the passage from Hyvernat's *Actes des martyrs* quoted on p. 19.

Tubi 3 (Dec. 29) is Innocents' Day in the Coptic calendars, the Greek Church celebrating also St. Marcellus (*ob.* c. 470), who, if identical with the ἀββᾶς Μάρκελλος in P. Stud. Pal. x. 35, was formerly venerated in Egypt, though now no longer, and he may have had a church at Oxyrhynchus (cf. p. 24), possibly that mentioned in l. 49. Since the service on Tubi 3 was at Phoebammon's church, ἡμέρα Μαρκέλλου is less likely in l. 35 than ἡμέρα νηπίων, but the fact that Tubi 3 was a Sunday is sufficient to account for the *σύναξις*. After that day there is a remarkable gap of a whole week without a *σύναξις*, but Tubi 11 (Jan. 6) is the date of the Epiphany in the Coptic as in other calendars, and no doubt ἐπιφάνεια, (τὰ) ἐπιφάνια, θεοφάνια or βαπτισμὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ (cf. l. 30) is to be supplied in l. 36. What saints, if any, were celebrated by the *συνάξεις* on Tubi 12-15 (Jan. 7-10), some of which may be connected with the Epiphany, is doubtful (cf. ll. 37-42, notes); but the service on Tubi 16 (Jan. 11) in l. 43 very likely commemorated St. Philotheus, a well-known saint at this period, and that at St. Mary's (l. 45) on Tubi 21 (Jan. 16) is clearly connected with the commemoration of her death in the mediaeval Coptic calendars and of the consecration of the first church of the Virgin in the modern calendar. Duchesne (*op. cit.* p. 269) compares that festival in Egypt with one observed in Gaul in the sixth century on Jan. 11 or 18 and in Spain in the seventh century on Dec. 18; cf. also the *σύναξις* of the Greek Church on Dec. 26 (p. 19). From this point up to l. 52 the numbers of the days are missing, but a festival of St. Julianus on Mecheir 1 (Jan. 26) is perhaps indicated by l. 48, and the festival of Ὑπαπαντή may have been recorded on Mecheir 8 (Feb. 2); cf. l. 52, note. The two *συνάξεις* on consecutive weekdays, Mecheir 11-12 (Feb. 5-6), at the church of St. Gabriel the archangel (ll. 54-5) may well be explained as implying that Mecheir 11 was his day, in accordance with the two services at St. Michael's on the occasion of his festival.

The mediaeval Coptic calendars, however, commemorate him on Choiak 22 (Dec. 18), the modern also on Phamenoth 30 (March 26), the Greek Church formerly only on Nov. 8, the *σύναξις τῶν ἀρχαγγέλων*, but now on March 26 and July 13, while Wüstenfeld's calendar mentions another commemoration of the archangel Michael on Mecheir 12. The only archangel of whom a commemoration is known before the ninth century is Michael (Duchesne, *op. cit.* p. 276), but as Gabriel had a church, he probably had a day also.

Mecheir 13 or 14 (Feb. 8 or 9) seems to have been a day of special importance (l. 56, note) owing to the approach of Lent (*ἡ ἀγία τεσσαρακοστή*), which in Egypt began not earlier than Mecheir 14 nor later than Phamenoth 19 (cf. e.g. P. Grenf. ii. 112), and in the year 536 on Mecheir 16 (Feb. 11); cf. p. 20. There was a *σύναξις* on Sunday Mecheir 15, but none on the 16th or any week-day before Saturday the 21st (ll. 58-9), when one of the two *συνάξεις* perhaps refers to the day of St. Onesimus, St. Paul's disciple. The absence of *συνάξεις* from Monday to Friday in this week is the more remarkable because in ll. 60-2, which cover the remaining nine days of Mecheir, the dates though incompletely preserved (cf. the notes) indicate only one week-day, also a Saturday, between two Sundays. This sudden rise of Saturday into prominence after Mecheir 15 (cf. p. 28) is not likely to be an accident in view of the significant fact that in about 365 the Council of Laodicea (can. 49, Labbe i. 1505) ordered the oblation of bread and wine in the Eucharist as well as the celebration of the festivals of martyrs to be confined during Lent to Saturdays and Sundays, and it harmonizes very well with the date of Easter in II which has been fixed on other grounds; cf. p. 20. In the concluding month Phamenoth (Feb. 25-March 26, ll. 63-8) the days are lost throughout, and since Wüstenfeld's *Synaxarium* ends at Mecheir 30, no comprehensive mediaeval list of the Coptic saints commemorated in the following month is available in a translation; so that how far Nilles' list, representing the modern calendar, is in accordance with mediaeval tradition, is, when Nau's and Tisserand's mediaeval calendars omit the day, uncertain. Hence any scheme of reconstruction for ll. 63-8 is hazardous, particularly since in three of the six *συνάξεις* even the name of the church is doubtful. We have, however, attempted a provisional reconstruction based on the assumption that the procedure noticed in ll. 59-62 was continued in conformity with the directions of the Council of Laodicea. The key to our restoration is the identification of SS. Theo[dotus] in l. 63 and St. The[odoros] in l. 65 (i.e. the bishop of Pentapolis) with the saints of those names who are now celebrated by the Coptic Church on Phamenoth 6 and 12 (March 2 and 8), but are not mentioned on those days in the mediaeval calendars. If that identification is correct, the days of these saints were no doubt recorded, the second probably falling a day later than

in the modern calendar; cf. ll. 63-6, note. The day of St. Colluthus also, a well-known saint at this period, may well have been recorded in l. 66, and in l. 68, if *Μαρίαν* is rightly restored, there may have been a reference to Easter Eve rather than to Good Friday or Easter Sunday. Whether the Sundays in Lent had special names remains uncertain.

Since the calendar clearly includes all the more important festivals during Phaophi—Phamenoth, the absence of certain days and commemorations is noticeable. All Saints' day is celebrated by the Coptic Church on Phaophi 23 (Oct. 20), which is recorded as a Sunday in Π. Since in l. 10 *ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ* supersedes *κυριακή*, there is a presumption against regarding Phaophi 23 in Π as All Saints' day, though cf. note on l. 20. The mediaeval Coptic calendars also omit this festival, but the Syriac calendar of 411 commemorates All Martyrs on the Friday after Easter, while the Greek Church celebrates All Saints on the Sunday after Pentecost, this date having been chosen as early as the time of Chrysostom (*ob.* 407) for a festival of All Martyrs. Hence Oxyrhynchus in 536 may well have observed that festival at the Martyrs' church either on that day or the Friday after Easter, both of which fall outside the range of Π. Of a commemoration of All Souls' day, Nov. 2 in the Greek as in the Latin Church, but not observed in the Coptic, there is naturally no trace. The Greek Church, distinguishing St. James the *ἀδελφότητος* from St. James son of Alphaeus, celebrates the former since the tenth century on Oct. 23, the Coptic similarly on Phaophi 26 (the same day) and on Epeiph 18 or Choiak 30. No *σύναξις* is recorded in Π on Phaophi 26 and St. James is not mentioned on Choiak 30, so that if a festival of St. James was observed at this period Epeiph 18 is a more likely date. St. James son of Alphaeus, who is honoured by the Greeks on Oct. 2 or 9, by the Copts on Mecheir 10 (Feb. 4), when no *σύναξις* is recorded in Π, but in the mediaeval Coptic calendars on Mecheir 11 (Feb. 5) and Phaophi 5 (Oct. 2), is in the same position. Neither St. Demetrius *Μυρόβλυτος* (*ob.* about 306), an important saint commemorated on Phaophi 29 (Oct. 26) by both Copts and Greeks, nor St. Barnabas the Apostle, whose day was Pauni 17 (June 11) in the mediaeval calendars, but is Choiak 21 (Dec. 17) in the modern, is mentioned. The absence of a *σύναξις* in honour of St. Stephen on Choiak 30 or Tubi 1, if ll. 33-4 are rightly restored, has already been discussed; cf. pp. 28-9. St. John the Evangelist's day in the Coptic calendars is primarily Tubi 4 (Dec. 30), when there was no *σύναξις* in Π, and since his festival would naturally be celebrated at the church of 'the Evangelist' (cf. p. 25), the only place where *ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ* can come in connexion with that church is in l. 42 (Tubi 15 = Jan. 10), for ll. 7 and 23 refer to Sundays. It is, however, more probable that St. John's day fell outside the period covered by Π, perhaps on Thoth 29 or 30 (Sept. 26 or 27) or Pachon 13 or 16 (May 8 or 11)

when he is also commemorated on days corresponding to the two commemorations of him in the Greek Church on Sept. 26 and May 8. The Circumcision (Tubi 6 = Jan. 1 in the Coptic calendars) is not marked by a *σύναξις*, an omission which is not surprising in view of the absence of that festival from the old Syriac, Roman, and Carthaginian calendars, although it is found in Gallican use in the sixth century, and in the early Byzantine calendars. Tubi 27 (Jan. 22) is the day of St. Phoebammon in the Coptic synaxary consulted by Amélineau (*l. c.*), but though l. 47 might refer to this day the *σύναξις* was not at his church, and is therefore clearly unconnected with his festival. The Finding of the Cross by the Empress Helena in 326 is celebrated in the mediaeval and modern Coptic calendars on Phamenoth 10 (March 6) in addition to the Exaltation on Thoth 17 (Sept. 14), which alone is now celebrated in the Greek Church, though the Menol. Basil. also records the Apparition of the Cross on May 7. There was probably no *σύναξις* on Phamenoth 10, which falls on a Thursday in Lent (cf. p. 30), and whether even apart from that circumstance there would have been a festival in connexion with the Cross is doubtful.

In the Julian equivalents of Egyptian days appended to the text the numbers in brackets give the dates in an ordinary year which was not bissextile; cf. p. 20.

Col. i.

		+ Γνώσις συνάξεων μετὰ τὸ κατελθ(εῖν)	
ινδ(ικτίονος) ιδ		ἐν Ἀλεξανδρ(εία) τὸν πάπα, οὕ(τως)	
Φαῶφι	κγ	εἰς τὴν Φοιβάμμωνος κυριακ(ή),	A.D. 535. Oct. 21 (20) Sun.
	κε	εἰς τὸν ἅγι(ον) Σερῆνον ἡμέρ(α) μεταν(οίας),	23 (22) Tues.
	5 λ	εἰς τὴν μαρτύρ(ων) κυριακ(ή),	28 (27) Sun.
Ἀθὺρ	γ	εἰς τὴν Φοιβάμμωνος ἡμέρ(α) Ἐπιμάχ(ου),	31 (30) Wed.
	ζ	εἰς τὸν εὐαγγελιστ(ήν) κυριακ(ή),	Nov. 4 (3) Sun.
	ιβ	εἰς τὸν ἅγι(ον) Μιχαηλᾶ ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ,	9 (8) Fri.
	ιγ	εἰς τὸν αὐτόν,	10 (9) Sat.
10 ιδ		εἰς τὸν ἅγι(ον) Ἰουστον ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ,	11 (10) Sun.
	ιε	εἰς τὸν ἅγι(ον) Μηνᾶν ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ,	12 (11) Mon.
	ις	εἰς τὸν αὐτόν, — — —	13 (12) Tues.
	ις	εἰς τὸν ἅγι(ον) Ἰο[υ]στον,	14 (13) Wed.
[Χοΐακ]		6 lines lost.	
20 ζ		εἰς τὸν ἅγι(ον) Βίκτορα,	Dec. 4 (3) Tues.
	[ι]β	εἰς τὴν Ἀννιανῆς κ[υρια]κ(ή),	9 (8) Sun.

	ιε	εἰς τὸν ἅγιον Κοσμᾶ ἡ[μέ]ρα Ἰσίωνος,	12 (11) Wed.
	ιθ	εἰς τὸν εὐαγγελιστ[ὴν] κυριακ(ή),	16 (15) Sun.
	κβ	εἰς τὸν ἅγι(ον) Φιλόξεν[ο]ν ἡμέρ(α) αὐτοῦ,	19 (18) Wed.
25	κγ	εἰς τὸν αὐτόν, - -	20 (19) Thur.
	κδ	εἰς τὸν αὐτόν,	21 (20) Fri.
	κε	ὁμοίως εἰς τὸν αὐτόν,	22 (21) Sat.
	κς	εἰς τὸν ἅγι(ον) Σε[ρ]ῆνον κυριακ(ή),	23 (22) Sun.
	κζ	εἰς τὸν αὐτόν, - - -	24 (23) Mon.
30	κη	εἰς τὴν ἀγί(αν) Μαρτίαν γέννα τοῦ Χριστοῦ,	25 (24) Tues.
	κθ	εἰς τὴν αὐτήν, - - -	26 (25) Wed.
	λ	εἰς τὴν αὐτήν ὁμοίως,	27 (26) Thur.

Col. ii.

	Τῦβι	α	εἰς τὸν ἅγι(ον) Πέτρ[ο]ν ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ,	Dec. 28 (27) Fri.
			ὁμοίως καὶ εἰς τὸν ἅγι(ον) [Παῦλον ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ,	
35	γ	εἰς τὴν Φοιβάμμ[ωνος] κυριακή,	30 (29) Sun.	
	ια	εἰς τὴν Φοιβάμμ[ωνος] ἐπιφάνεια τοῦ Χριστοῦ, A.D. 536.	Jan. 7 (6) Mon.	
	ιβ	εἰς τὴν νοτινή[ν] ἐκκλησίαν,	8 (7) Tues.	
	ιγ	εἰς τὸν ἅγι(ον) Φιλόξ[ε]νον,	9 (8) Wed.	
	ιδ	εἰς τὸν ἅγιον Μ[ι]χ[α]ηλᾶ ἡμέρα,	10 (9) Thur.	
40		εἰς τὴν ἅμα [Ἡραΐδος] ἡμέρα αὐτῆς (?),		
	ιε	εἰς τὴν ἀγί(αν) Εὐφ[η]μίαν ἡμέρα,	11 (10) Fri.	
		εἰς τὸν εὐαγ[γ]ελιστ[ὴν],		
	ις	εἰς τὴν Φοιβάμμ[ωνος] ἡμέρα Φιλοθέου (?)	12 (11) Sat.	
	ιζ	εἰς τὴν Ἀννια[ν]ῆς κυριακή,	13 (12) Sun.	
45	κα	εἰς τὴν ἀγί(αν) Μα[ρ]τίαν ἡμέρα αὐτῆς (?),	17 (16) Thur.	
	[κδ	εἰς τὸν ἅγ]ι(ον) Ἰε[ρ]ημίαν κυριακή (?),	20 (19) Sun.	
	[κ .	εἰς τὸν βα]πτιστ[ὴν],		
[Μεχεῖρ	α(?)	εἰς τὸν ἅγι(ον)] Ἰουλ[ιαν]ὸν ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ (?),	27 (26) Sun.	
	[.	εἰς τὸν ἅγι] (ον) Ἀββ[ᾶ] ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ (?),		
50	[ὁμοίως καὶ εἰς] τὸ β[ορριν]ὸν μαρτύριον (?),		
	[.	εἰς] [τὴν ἀγ]ί(αν) Εὐφ[η]μίαν,		
	[η]	εἰς τὸν ἅγι(ον) Ζαχ[α]ρίαν κυριακή (?),	Feb. 3 (2) Sun.	
	θ	εἰς τὸν ἅγι(ον) Σε[ρ]ῆνον,	4 (3) Mon.	
	ια	εἰς τὸν ἅγι(ον) Γαβρ[ι]ήλ ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ (?),	6 (5) Wed.	

55	[ιβ]	εἰς τὸν αὐτόν,	7 (6) Thur.
	[ιδ?]	εἰς τὸν ἅγι(ον) ἄπα Νοῦπ ἡμέρα[α	9 (8) Sat.
	[ι]ε	εἰς τὴν Φοιβάμ[μωνος κυριακή,	10 (9) Sun.
	κα	εἰς τὸν ἅγι(ον) Φιλ[όξενον ἡμέρα,	16 (15) Sat.
		ὁμ(οίως) καὶ εἰς τὸν ἄ[γι(ον),	
60	κ[β]	εἰς τὸν αὐτόν [κυριακή,	17 (16) Sun.
	κ[η]	εἰς τὴν νοτιν(ήν) ἐκ[κλησίαν ἡμέρα,	23 (22) Sat.
	κθ	εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν [κυριακή,	24 (23) Sun.
Φαμενώθ	[ς?]	εἰς τὸν ἅγι(ον) Θεό[δοτον ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ (?),	March 2 Sun.
	[ιβ?]	εἰς τὸν ἅγι(ον) Φιλόξ[ενον ἡμέρα,	8 Sat.
65	[ιγ?]	εἰς τὸν ἅγι(ον) Θε[όδωρον ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ,	9 Sun.
	[ιθ?]	εἰς τὴν Φοιβ[άμμωνος ἡμέρα Κολλούθου (?),	15 Sat.
	[κ?]	εἰς τὴν αὐτ[ὴν κυριακή (?),	16 Sun.
	[κς(?)]	εἰς τὴν ἀγί[(αν) Μαρίαν ἡμέρα(?]	22 Sat.

Perhaps 1 line lost.

2. ἰνδ/ Π. 10. ἰουστον Π. 13. ἰο[υ]στον Π. 22. ἰσιωνος Π. 46. ἰε[Π.
48. ἰουλ[Π.

‘List of services after the patriarch descended to Alexandria, as follows: 14th indiction, Phaophi 23rd at Phoebammon’s, Sunday; 25th at St. Serenus’, day of Repentance; 30th at the Martyrs’, Sunday.

Hathur 3rd at Phoebammon’s, day of Epimachus; 7th at the Evangelist’s, Sunday; 12th at St. Michael’s, his day; 13th at the same; 14th at St. Justus’, his day; 15th at St. Menas’, his day; 16th at the same; 17th at St. Justus’; . . .

Choiak . . . ; 7th at St. Victor’s; 12th at Anniane’s, Sunday; 15th at St. Cosmas’, day of Ision; 19th at the Evangelist’s, Sunday; 22nd at St. Philoxenus’, his day; 23rd at the same; 24th at the same; 25th likewise at the same; 26th at St. Serenus’, Sunday; 27th at the same; 28th at St. Mary’s, Nativity of Christ; 29th at the same; 30th at the same likewise.

Tubi 1st at St. Peter’s, his day; likewise also at St. Paul’s, his day; 3rd at Phoebammon’s, Sunday; 11th at Phoebammon’s, Epiphany of Christ; 12th at the Southern church; 13th at St. Philoxenus’; 14th at St. Michael’s, day of . . . ; at ama Heraïs’, her day; 15th at St. Euphemia’s, day of . . . ; at the Evangelist’s; 16th at Phoebammon’s, day of Philotheus; 17th at Anniane’s, Sunday; 21st at St. Mary’s, her day; 24th at St. Jeremiah’s, Sunday; 2[.]th at the Baptist’s.

Mecheir 1st at St. Julianus’, his day; . . . at St. abba . . . , his day; likewise at the Northern Martyr’s shrine; . . . at St. Euphemia’s; 8th at St. Zacharias’, Sunday; 9th at St. Serenus’; 11th at St. Gabriel’s, his day; 12th at the same; 14th at St. apa Noup’s, day of . . . ; 15th at Phoebammon’s, Sunday; 21st at St. Philoxenus’, day of . . . ; likewise also at St. . . . ; 22nd at the same, Sunday; 28th at the Southern church, day of . . . ; 29th at the same, Sunday.

Phamenoth 6th at St. Theodotus', his day; 12th at St. Philoxenus', day of . . . ; 13th at St. Theodorus', his day; 19th at Phoebammon's, day of Colluthus; 20th at the same, Sunday; 26th at St. Mary's, day of . . .'

1. Cf. pp. 21-2. *ἐν* instead of *εἰς* is common; cf. e. g. 144. 11 *καταγαγεῖν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ* and, for an early instance, P. Par. 10. 2 *ἀνακεχώρηκεν ἐν Ἀλεξ.*

2. *ιδ*: the *ι* is partly effaced, but *ιδ(ι)κ(τίονος)* *δ* cannot be read, even apart from the difficulty that would arise concerning the date, since Phaophi 23 did not fall on a Sunday of the 4th indiction between 390 and 675, both of which years are unsuitable; cf. p. 20.

πάπα: the writer is fond of using this genitival form for the accusative; cf. l. 8 *Μιχαηλᾶ* and l. 22 *Κοσμᾶ*. For the name of the patriarch see pp. 21 and 43.

3. *Φοιβάμμωνος*: cf. pp. 23-5. This day was probably not All Saints' (cf. p. 31), and St. Dionysius of Corinth, martyr under Diocletian, and the prophet Joel, formerly honoured on Phaophi 23 (Nau and Tisserand, *l. c.*), are ignored.

κυριακ(ή): this word and *ἡμέρα*, wherever they come in Π, might be in the dative, but *γέννα* in l. 30 is in the nominative.

4. *Σερήνον*: cf. ll. 28-9 and 53, 1151. 47, and B. G. U. 954. 3, 29 (Heracleopolis). A Nitrian abbot visited by Cassianus in 395 and author of two extant discourses is less likely to be meant than a disciple of Origen, martyr under Severus according to Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* vi. 4). The amba Serenus, archimandrite, and Serenus, *ἡγούμενος*, formerly commemorated on Phamenoth 5 and 6 (Tisserand, *l. c.*) seem to be later. On the question of St. Serenus' day cf. ll. 20 and 53, notes, and for *ἡμέρα μετανοίας* cf. p. 26. On Phaophi 25 (Oct. 22) the Coptic calendars commemorate two eremites of the Thebaid and St. Julius of Akfâhs, martyr under Diocletian; cf. p. 39.

5. *μαρτύρ(ων)*: there was a well-known Coptic monastery of this name at Esna (Lato-
polis), and a church *τριῶν μαρτύρων* at Arsinoë is mentioned in e. g. P. Brit. Mus. 113 (8). 11, and one *τοῦ ἁγίου μάρτυρος* at a village near Antinoë in Crum, P. Brit. Mus. Coptic, p. 450. The Coptic calendars on Phaophi 30 (Oct. 27) commemorate SS. Abraham, a Syrian anchorite (fourth century?), Valens, Anatolius (date uncertain), and a Julius and others, martyrs under Decius; the Greek church St. Capitolina, martyr under Diocletian, and St. Nestor (*οδ.* 306), and two days earlier (Oct. 25) SS. Marcianus and Martyrius (fourth century), whom Wüstenfeld's and the modern Coptic calendars assign to Oct. 28, calling Martyrius Mercurius. *Μαρτυρ(ίου)* could be read, and in that case he would stand in the same position as Phoebammon, who became a regular saint; cf. pp. 23-5. *Μαρτυρ(ιανού)*, referring to a saint now honoured by the Copts on Pachon 21, is also possible; but since there is a doubt whether there ever was a Coptic saint Martyrius, and Martyrianus' day is far removed from Phaophi 30, we prefer *μαρτύρ(ων)* in view of the parallels and the rarity of abbreviations of proper names in Π. Moreover if Phaophi 30 had been the day of Martyri(an)us, *ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ* would be expected in spite of its being Sunday; cf. l. 10.

6. *ἡμέρα Ἐπιμάχου*: cf. pp. 24 and 26-7. Wüstenfeld's calendar commemorates on this day SS. Cyriacus (fourth century), and Athanasius and Irene, martyrs under Diocletian; Morcelli's calendar Cyriacus; the Menol. Basil. Epimachus and Eutropia.

7. *τὸν εὐαγγελιστ(ήν)*: cf. pp. 25-6, and, on the date of the festival of St. John, p. 31. A church at Arsinoë was called *τοῦ ἁγίου ἀποστόλου* simply; cf. P. Stud. Pal. x. 75. 6. St. George of Alexandria (fourth century?, not the soldier), who is celebrated on this day in the Coptic calendars, is ignored.

8-11. Cf. p. 27. *Μιχαηλᾶ* is not a correct form; cf. l. 2, note. The other saints now honoured on Hathur 12-15 are unimportant. From P. S. I. 63. 25 sqq. it appears that the whole festival of St. Michael lasted eight days or more, since an agreement was made to repay a loan at Oxyrhynchus on the 8th day *τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ ἀρχαγγέλου Μ[ιχ]αήλ τοῦ*

Ἀθὺρ μηνός. There was a church of St. Michael at Arsinoë (e. g. P. Klein. Form. 845), as well as at Alexandria (p. 25). For other mentions of St. Justus' church see p. 23.

12. The lines after αὐτόν (cf. ll. 25, 29, 31) are merely intended to fill up space, not to indicate a repetition of ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ.

13. In the Greek and Coptic Churches Nov. 13 (Hathur 17) is the *obit* of St. John Chrysostom, the translation of his relics being celebrated on Jan. 27 by the Greeks, but on Nov. 13 by the Copts, who also commemorate his death on Pachon 12 (May 7). For Ἰο[ϐ]στον cf. l. 10; we are unable to reconcile the three doubtful letters with Ἰά[κ]ωβον or the name of any other Greek or Coptic saint, but this second σύναξις at St. Justus', for which no special reason is assigned, is remarkable. A similar difficulty arises in ll. 20 and 29, where it can be explained by the supposed omission of ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ; but that is inadmissible here, if Ἰο[ϐ]στον is right, since his day has already occurred in l. 10.

14-19. Three of these lines probably recorded services on the Sundays Hathur 21, 28, and Choiak 5 (cf. p. 22), and the remaining three some of the festivals of SS. Cosmas (l. 22, note), Philip the Apostle (Hathur 18 = Nov. 14 in both the Greek and Coptic churches), Matthew the Apostle (Hathur 20 = Nov. 16 in a thirteenth century Coptic calendar; cf. Nau, *l. c.*), Anianus, second patriarch of Alexandria (the same day in the Coptic calendars), Andrew the Apostle (Choiak 4 = Nov. 30 in both the Coptic and Greek churches), who probably had a monastery at Oxyrhynchus (146. 1, 147. 1), and Peter of Alexandria, martyr under Diocletian (Hathur 29 = Nov. 25 in the Coptic calendars; cf. Hyvernat, *Actes des martyrs*, i, p. 263).

20. Βικροπα: cf. 1151. 49 and two inscriptions from Bawît in Hall, *Coptic and Greek Texts*, pp. 143-4, where SS. Victor, Phoebammon (cf. pp. 23-5), Menas (cf. l. 11), and George come at the head of lists of saints. εὐκτηρία of St. Victor are known at Lycopolis (P. Cairo Maspero i. 67006. 56) and Syene (P. Munich 9. 37); a church at Aphrodito (P. Brit. Mus. 1572, &c.); a λαύρα at Arsinoë was called after him (i. e. his church; P. Klein. Form. 675. 2, &c.), and he is often mentioned in Coptic texts, but which of the five (?) different saints of this name occurring in the modern Coptic calendar was meant in l. 20 is not clear. Abul-Barakât's list (Tisserand, *l. c.*) mentions only one (Epeiph 20 = July 14), Nau's menologia the same one and two more (Hathur 5 = Nov. 1 and Mesore 24 = Aug. 17), but none of these days corresponds with any of the eight dates in the modern calendar (Hathur 1, 10, 21, 27, Choiak 6, Mecheir 14, Pharmouthi 4, 27) on which a Victor is mentioned. Choiak 7 in l. 20 suggests a connexion with the bishop Victor coupled with the presbyter Anatolius (date?) on Choiak 6; but if this Victor had been mentioned in l. 19, εἰς τὸν αὐτόν would be expected in l. 20 on the analogy of e. g. ll. 8-9, while, if the date of the commemoration has merely altered by a day (cf. the case of Epimachus, pp. 26-7), ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ is wanted in l. 20. It is possible that the omission is accidental here and in l. 28, a hypothesis which would remove the similar difficulty in l. 29, where the second σύναξις at St. Serenus' (on a Monday) is hard to account for if the preceding Sunday was not his day. But in view of the inapplicability of this explanation to l. 13 (cf. note), we hesitate to postulate an inconsistency between ll. 10 and 28 with regard to the choice of κυριακή and ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ, so that it remains doubtful whether Choiak 7 has anything to do with a festival in honour of St. Victor. Hence he is probably identical with the so-called son of Romanus, martyr under Diocletian, whose day is Pharmouthi 27 and who was the most important Victor; cf. Amélineau, *Les actes des martyrs*, pp. 177 sqq. On Choiak 7 the mediaeval Coptic calendars celebrate several unimportant saints, the modern calendar Heraclas 8th patriarch of Alexandria, the Menol. Basil. St. Theodore of Egypt, Theodulus of Cyprus, and the prophet Zephaniah.

21. Ἀννιαυῆς: cf. l. 44 and p. 25. The name Ἀνειανή occurs in Lefebvre, *Inscript. chrét.* no. 65. St. Anne, mother of the Virgin, who is commemorated in Wüstenfeld's and

the modern Coptic calendar on Hathur 11 (Nov. 7), in Nau's and the modern on Choiak 13 (Dec. 9, the Conception), and in all Coptic calendars together with the Greek Menol. Basil. on Mesore 1 (July 25), and by the Menol. Basil. also on Sept. 9, is hardly likely to be meant, though Choiak 12 comes near to the feast of the Conception; for apart from the doubt about the early date of that festival, which cannot be traced back further than the seventh or eighth century (Nilles, *op. cit.* p. 349), the two *συνάξεις* at Anniane's church were both on a Sunday and so need imply no special festival. Procopius (*De aedif.* i. 3) states that Justinian erected a church in honour of St. Anne, but though the Latin Church did not celebrate her till much later, the insertion of *ἀγίας* would be expected, if she were meant. July 25 is most likely to have been her day at Oxyrhynchus, if she was commemorated.

22. Κοσμᾶ ἡμέρα Ἰσιωνος: cf. l. 2, note, and p. 27. The dedication of a church to St. Cosmas without St. Damian is noticeable. The Greek Church since the tenth century distinguishes three pairs of these saints (1) July 1, Romans martyred under Carinus, (2) Oct. 17, Arabs martyred under Diocletian, (3) Nov. 1, Asiatics, sons of Theodote, apparently later. The Coptic church since the thirteenth century celebrates the Arabs on Hathur 22 (Nov. 18) and the Romans on Pauni 22 (June 16); a third commemoration in the modern Coptic calendar on Choiak 1 (Nov. 27) seems to refer to the Asiatics. Hathur 22 and Choiak 1 come in the period covered by the lacuna in ll. 14-19, where *εἰς τὸν ἅγιον Κοσμᾶ ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ* may well have occurred on the first of these two dates. The saints honoured by the Coptic Church on Choiak 15 are not important.

23. Cf. l. 7, note. On Choiak 19 (Dec. 15) the Coptic calendars mention St. John, *ἡγούμενος* (i. e. John, archimandrite of Siût about 400), and Theophania.

24-7. St. Philoxenus, who is also mentioned in 1150. 2 (sixth century), 1151. 48 (fifth century?) and P. Stud. Pal. x. 35. 11 (cf. p. 24), is either an otherwise unknown Egyptian saint or identical with the monophysite bishop of Hierapolis (*ob.* about 523), who is honoured in the mediaeval Syrian Jacobite menologia on Feb. 18 (Nau, *op. cit.*, p. 72) and other days. The four *συνάξεις* in his honour (one more than at Christmas) indicate his great popularity, which would harmonize with the shortness of the interval between his death and the date of Π, if the bishop of Hierapolis is meant; but 1151 must in that case be later than 523. The day of St. Gabriel the archangel, Choiak 22 in the Coptic calendars, may have been Mecheir 11; cf. pp. 29-30. The other saints honoured by the Copts or Greeks on Choiak 22-5 are not important.

28-9. For St. Serenus cf. l. 4, note, and, for the two consecutive *συνάξεις* at his church, l. 20, note. Choiak 26 (Dec. 22) in the Coptic and Greek calendars is the day of St. Anastasia, martyr under Diocletian, and in Basset's mediaeval Coptic synaxarium of abba Hieracion, who had a church at Oxyrhynchus (cf. l. 46, note, and p. 24), but is here ignored. Choiak 27 in the Coptic calendars is the day of Psote and Callinicus, bishops of the Thebaid and martyrs under Diocletian.

30-1. For Christmas Day cf. pp. 20 and 28, and, for *γέννα τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, P. Grenf. ii. 112 (a). *Ἰ Χ(ριστὸ)ς Μαρία γέννα καὶ Μαρία Χ(ριστὸ)ς γέννα καὶ Χ(ριστὸ)ς Μαρία γέννα*, which seems to be connected with the much disputed formula *χμγ. γέννα* there, as here, is probably a substantive, *Μαρία* being a mistake for *Μαρίας*. A *κηπίον* of the church of St. Mary is mentioned in 147. 1.

32. On Choiak 30 (Dec. 26) the Coptic calendars commemorate David and St. James, bishop of Jerusalem (cf. p. 31), as well as the second day of the Nativity, while the Greek Church commemorates the Virgin (Flight to Egypt; cf. p. 19 and l. 45) and others.

33-4. For the festival of St. Peter and St. Paul, or less probably St. Stephen, see pp. 28-9. In the mediaeval Coptic and Greek calendars the day of SS. Peter and Paul is Epeiph 5 (June 29) and St. Peter now has his own days on Mesore 7 (July 31) and Jan. 16. Numerous other saints called Peter are celebrated by the Copts, but not on any

day close to Tubi 1. A church of St. Peter at Arsinoë occurs in P. Stud. Pal. x. 75. 3. Other saints commemorated on Tubi 1 by the Copts include, besides St. Stephen, St. Leontius the Syrian, martyr under Maximian, after whom was named a hospital at Hermopolis (P. Klein. Form. 314. 1, unless the reference there is to St. Leontius the Arab), Paul bishop of Ephesus, and Ischyriion and Aesculapius, who with 8,140 companions were martyred at Panopolis.

35. Cf. p. 29.

36. For the Epiphany cf. p. 29. In the mediaeval and modern Coptic Church this festival is preceded by a vigil (cf. p. 28) and continues for three days, but since the *συνάξεις* on the six following days here were at different churches, the presumption is rather against their being connected with the Epiphany.

37. *νοτινή[ν ἐκκλησίαν]*: cf. l. 61, p. 23, and l. 47, note. There was a church of this name at Aphrodito; cf. e. g. P. Brit. Mus. 1419. 526, where the editor has overlooked the parallel from 43 verso. St. Theodorus Orientalis, martyr under Diocletian, whose *Acts* are extant, is celebrated by the Copts on Tubi 12, and *ἡμέρα Θεοδώρου* may have occurred here, since the church of St. Theodorus (cf. ll. 63-6, note) probably refers to a different saint of that name.

38. *Φιλόξ[ενον]*: cf. ll. 24-7, note. *Φιλόθ[εον]* (cf. l. 43, note) is unsuitable. On Tubi 13 (Jan. 8) the Coptic calendars commemorate the first miracle at Cana and sometimes St. Theophilus, whom the Menol. Basil. also mentions on this day, and St. Menas (cf. l. 111).

39. *Μ[ι]χ[αηλᾶ]*: cf. l. 8. Tubi 14 (Jan. 9) is in the Coptic calendars the day of Maximus, who is apparently identical with the monk of St. Macarius honoured with Domitius three days later, and sometimes the day of Archelides and Irene (date uncertain), while the early Greek calendars commemorate St. Polyeuctus (*οβ.* in Armenia about 259).

40. *ἄμα [Ἡραίδος]*: cf. p. 24. Her day was subsequently a fortnight later.

41. *Εὐφ[ημίαν]*: cf. l. 51 and pp. 23-4. She was an important saint whose day in the mediaeval Coptic and Greek calendars is Epeiph 18 (July 12) and in the modern Coptic one Epeiph 17 (July 11) and Pauni 8 (June 2) as well, so that *ἡμέρα αὐτῆς* is unlikely either here or in l. 51. On Tubi 15 Wüstenfeld's calendar mentions the prophet Obadiah and a fourth-century St. Gregory (not of Nyssa); the modern calendar Cyriacus and Julitta, martyrs under Diocletian; the Menol. Basil. SS. Gregory of Nyssa (*οβ.* about 395), Domitianus (*οβ.* about 600), and Marcianus.

42. Cf. l. 7 and pp. 25-6.

43. On Tubi 16 (Jan. 11) the Coptic calendars all commemorate St. Philotheus, martyr under Diocletian, and since a church called after him is several times mentioned in the Aphrodito papyri (e. g. P. Brit. Mus. 1572. 9), and, as Mr. Crum informs us, in unpublished Coptic texts from Thebes, his day is likely to have been mentioned here.

44. *Ἀννια[νῆς]*: cf. l. 21, note, and p. 25. On Tubi 17 the Coptic calendars mention St. Maximus (cf. l. 39, note), the companion of St. Domitius, the Menol. Basil. SS. Tatiana, martyr under Severus Alexander, Meorteus, martyr under Diocletian, and Athanasius. But *ἡμέρα αὐτῆς* would be more likely than a mention of any of these, and *κυριακή* is still more probable.

45. *κα*: cf. p. 29. The Coptic calendars commemorate, besides the Virgin, Hilaria, daughter of the Emperor Zeno, St. Gregory of Nyssa (cf. l. 41, note), and St. Agnes (third century).

46. *Ἰε[ρημίαν]*: i. e. the prophet Jeremiah, whose day in the Coptic calendars is Thoth 8 (Sept. 5) or Pachon 5 (April 30), in the Greek Church May 1, so that *ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ* is unlikely. A monastery dedicated to him near Memphis (P. Stud. Pal. x. 295-8) has been recently excavated by Quibell, and another, in the Thinite pagarchy, is known from P. Brit. Mus. 1460. 12. *Ἰε[ρώνυμον]*, whom the Copts honour on Phamenoth 15 (March 11) or Thoth 20

(Sept. 17), and Ἱε[ρα]κα, an Egyptian martyr mentioned in the Syriac calendar of 411 on June 15, who is different from a Nitrian monk contemporary with Chrysostom and formerly celebrated by the Greek Church (Nilles, *op. cit.* ii, p. 43), are less likely; but Ἱε[ρακίωνα] (who might be identical with the Syriac Hierax) ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ is possible; cf. p. 24. His church, however, may be the one meant in l. 49, where ἅγι[ον] ἀββ[ᾶ] [Ἱερακίωνα] can be restored, but the occurrence of ἅγιος, which is absent in 1053, is a slight objection to introducing him in either passage. This saint's day, moreover, was Choiak 26 (Dec. 22) in the fourteenth century according to Basset's synaxarium (*Patrol. Orient.* iii, p. 525). He lived in the reign of Diocletian and escaped from captivity at Oxyrhynchus (Amélineau, *op. cit.* p. 83). The number of the day in l. 46 is doubtful, κδ being restored because a Sunday is wanted in l. 46 or 47 before the Sunday which is apparently accounted for in l. 48. St. Antony the Great is honoured by both Copts and Greeks on Tubi 22 (Jan. 17), and if l. 46 refers to that day, he may well have been mentioned. Line 47 would then probably refer to Tubi 24. On that day (Jan. 19) the mediaeval Coptic calendars mention SS. Mary, a nun, Apa Psote, and Demetrius, the modern one commemorates St. Mercurius of Alexandria, while the Menol. Basil. mentions amongst others St. Macarius, a famous Egyptian saint (*ob.* 391; cf. l. 47, note).

47. τὸν βα[πτισ]τήν: cf. pp. 25-6. His execution is commemorated by the Copts on Thoth 2 (Aug. 30), by the Greek Church on Aug. 29; his conception by both on Thoth 26 (Sept. 23); his nativity by both on Pauni 30 (June 24); the finding of his head by both on Mecheir 30 (Feb. 24), and that of his bones by the Copts on Thoth 16 (Sept. 13) or Pauni 2 (May 27), by the Greeks on May 25; the deposition of his head on Phaophi 29 (Oct. 26) by the Copts; his incarceration on ἐπαγομ. 1 (Aug. 24) by the Copts, the general σύναξις in his honour being on Jan. 7 (Tubi 12) in the Greek Church. The last is the only date at all near that in l. 47, which cannot be earlier than Tubi 23 or later than Mecheir 4 and was probably a week-day between the two Sundays Tubi 24 and Mecheir 1; cf. the next note. The σύναξις on Tubi 12 (l. 37), which was at the Southern church, is not likely to be connected with a festival of the Baptist, and, Mecheir 30 not being available, since there was no σύναξις on that day, the only place in Π which is at all suitable for a festival in his honour is l. 47; but his day is more likely to have been Thoth 2 or Pauni 30, outside the range of Π. The Coptic Church does not celebrate any very important saints from Tubi 23 to 30, St. Macarius (cf. l. 46, note) being honoured on Tubi 8 or Phamenoth 27 or later.

48. Ἱουλ[ιανόν]: a Sunday service on Mecheir 1 is expected between ll. 47 and 51, and since Ἱούδ[αν], i. e. the Apostle, who is honoured on that day in the mediaeval Coptic calendars, cannot be read, the choice lies between Ἱουλ[ιανόν] and Ἱούλ[ιον]. A church of St. Julius at Arsinoë is known from P. Klein. Form. 743. If Ἱούλ[ιον] be read, St. Julius of Αἰγῆς, the historian and martyr under Diocletian, whose *Acts* are known (Amélineau, *op. cit.* pp. 123 sqq.) and whose day is Thoth 22 (Sept. 19), is more likely to be meant than St. Julius bishop of Rome in 336-52 (now Mecheir 3, but not in the mediaeval calendars), or a third Julius, martyr under Decius (Phaophi 25, 27, or 30). Hence ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ would be unlikely, unless l. 48 be referred to Mecheir 3, the festival of the Roman St. Julius. In that case l. 47 might refer to Mecheir 1, and the week-days between the two Sundays in ll. 46-7 would be passed over, which is not a very satisfactory hypothesis, since Lent had not yet begun (cf. p. 30). On Mecheir 1, however, the Coptic Church commemorates St. Julianus, martyr with 5,000 companions, and although he is not mentioned in the mediaeval calendars, we on the whole prefer Ἱουλ[ιανόν] to Ἱούλ[ιον], since the choice of the church would be accounted for, if it was his day.

49. Probably either ἀββ[ᾶ] Ἱερακίωνα (cf. l. 46, note), or ἀββ[ᾶ] Παῦλον ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ, referring to the chief of the eremites (*ob.* 341), who is celebrated in the mediaeval and

modern Coptic calendars on Mecheir 2 (Jan. 27), the approximate date of this line, or ἀββ[ᾶ Μάρκελλον (cf. P. Stud. Pal. x. 35 and p. 24), who is perhaps the Marcellus mentioned on Epeiph 22 of Nau's calendar but has disappeared from the modern one.

50. For [εἰς τὸν ἅγι(ον)] Τοβ[ίαν, i. e. Τωβ[ίαν, there is barely room, and cf. p. 23. τὸ β[ορρινὸν μαρτύριον is more likely than e. g. τὸ Β[ασιλίου or Β[αρσαύμου, a bishop of Edessa commemorated on Mecheir 9 in the mediaeval Coptic calendars; but]τοβ[can be part of a proper name in the genitive, like Φοιβάμμωνος (cf. p. 23), preceded by εἰς τήν. In that case Ἄρισ]τοβ[ούλου, one of the seventy-two disciples, now honoured by the Copts on Phamenoth 19 but absent from the mediaeval Coptic calendars, might be meant. σ, however, rather than τ, would then be expected to come over the ι of ἀγ]ί(ον) in l. 51, and on Phamenoth 19 there seems to have been a σύναξις at Phoebammon's church (l. 66).

51. Cf. l. 41, note. The saints commemorated by the Copts and Greeks from Mecheir 4 to 7 are not particularly important.

52. [η]: this is restored because the 9th (l. 53) was a Monday, so that a Sunday is wanted here. The day of St. Zachariah father of the Baptist is Thoth 8 (Sept. 5) in the mediaeval Coptic and Greek calendars; Z. the prophet is commemorated on Hathur 4 (Oct. 31) and Mecheir 14 (Feb. 8; so also the Menol. Basil.), a martyr Z. on Choiak 4 (Nov. 30), Z. of Antioch on Pachon 20 (May 15) and Z. an eremite on Pachon 26 (May 21) or Phaophi 13 (Oct. 10). Of these the festival of the prophet Zachariah on Mecheir 14 is much the nearest to Mecheir 8, and ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ is possible; but the latter day (Feb. 2) coincides with the festival known in Eastern churches as ὑπαπαντή, i. e. Presentation of Christ in the Temple, and in the Western as the Purification of the Virgin. In the East this festival can be traced back to 350-400 (Duchesne, *op. cit.* p. 272), and the universal observance of it in the Eastern Empire was ordained by Justinian in 542 (Niceph. *Hist. Eccl.* xvii. 28), only six years after Π was written, so that there may have been a reference to it here instead of κυριακή (cf. l. 10). Since in the East this festival has always been one of Christ rather than the Virgin, the selection of another church than St. Mary's would be intelligible, especially if St. Zachariah is the father of the Baptist. St. Simeon ὁ Θεοδόχος and St. Anne (cf. l. 21, note) are also honoured by the Copts on Mecheir 8, and by the Greeks on the next day (Feb. 3), but a mention of one of them is less likely here than κυριακή or ὑπαπαντή.

53. Σερ[ῆνον]: cf. l. 4, note. Σερ[απίωνα or Σέρ[γιον are also possible. A similar difficulty arises in P. Klein. Form. 627. ι ἅγι(ον) Σερ[(Arsinoite nome). The day of St. Sergius of Athribis, martyr under Diocletian, is Mecheir 13, only four days later than the date in l. 53, so that ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ might be supplied with Σέρ[γιον also. St. Sergius, companion of St. Bacchus, a Syrian martyr under Maximian, is honoured by both the Greek and Coptic churches on Phaophi 10 (Oct. 7). The Coptic calendars celebrate a Serapion, bishop of Niciu (fourth century), on Hathur 27 or 28 (which falls in the period of the lacuna in ll. 14-19); another, a martyr under Diocletian, whose *Acts* are extant (*Script. Copt.* iii. 1. iv), on Tubi 27 (twelve days before Mecheir 9), and a third Serapion on ἐπαγομ. ι (Aug. 24). But St. Serenus is much more likely to have been mentioned than any of these. On Mecheir 9 the Copts commemorate Paul, a Syrian martyr (fourth century); cf. l. 52, note.

54-5. Cf. pp. 23 and 29-30 and ll. 24-7, note. Α πρε(σβύτερος) τοῦ ἀρχαγγέλου Γαβριήλ in the Arsinoite nome is known from P. Stud. Pal. x. 177. 6. The various Coptic calendars on Mecheir 11 mention SS. James son of Alphaeus (cf. p. 31), Basilides, Justus son of the Emperor Numerianus (cf. p. 27), and Palatianus, bishop of Rome (third century), and on the 12th the Archangel Michael (cf. l. 8) and SS. Fabianus, bishop of Rome (ob. 250), and Gelasius (ob. 496).

56. ἅπα Νούπ ἡμέρ[α . . . : part of the ν of Νούπ and the rest of the line were on a separate fragment, which is suitably though not certainly placed here. The day is

probably Mecheir 13 or 14, for it cannot be earlier, and if it is later, $\iota\theta$ must be read for $\iota\epsilon$ in l. 57, to which there are objections. The various saints honoured in Mecheir by the Coptic and Greek churches do not include any whose name begins with N or ἄπα Ν, but the martyrdom of Anub under Diocletian is commemorated by the Copts on Pauni 19 (June 13) and formerly by the Greeks (Nilles, *op. cit.* ii, p. 42) on June 5, while an abba Nub or Anub, presbyter and martyr under Diocletian, whose *Acts* are extant (*Script. Copt.* iii. 1. ix), is celebrated by the Copts on Pauni 23 and sometimes on Epeiph 24 (July 11) also. If the position assigned to the fragment is correct, abba Nub is doubtless meant and ἡμέρ[α αὐτοῦ] is unlikely; but if it goes elsewhere, i. e. in ll. 14-19 or 59 or in a later column (cf. p. 20), either Ἄ[νούπ] or ἄπα[] Νούπ can be read, and ἡμέρ[α αὐτοῦ] might be right. ἄπα Ν[ούπ] would, however, still be the best restoration in l. 56. Ἄνούπ is a very common Byzantine name, so that ἄπ(α) Ἄνούπ should perhaps be read, possibly referring to the colleague of Apollo at Bawît; but cf. Crum, P. Rylands Copt. 461. 28-9, where apa Noub occurs.

The paragraphi above and below l. 56, elsewhere employed only at the end of a month in l. 5, draw special attention to this day as for some reason of exceptional importance. Since the *σύναξις* was not at St. Mary's, a festival of the Virgin (cf. p. 29) is unlikely, and of the Coptic saints honoured on Mecheir 13-14 (Feb. 8-9) Severus, patriarch of Antioch, or the prophet Zachariah (cf. l. 52, note) are the most likely to have been mentioned. In the Greek calendar Feb. 8 is the day of St. Theodorus the Great, *στρατηλάτης*, whom the Copts commemorate on Epeiph 20 (July 14) and who is probably not the St. Theodorus of l. 65; St. Cyril is honoured by the Latins on Feb. 9 as well as Jan. 28, while in the Coptic Church his days are Thoth 12 (Sept. 9) and Epeiph 3 (June 27) and in the Greek Jan. 18 and June 9. But none of these seems important enough to account for the paragraphi, which may well be connected with the circumstance that Lent began in 536 on Mecheir 16 (cf. p. 30). Mecheir 14 would be the last week-day before Lent, and this may have given a special importance to the *σύναξις*, whether the day was that of a saint, or 'of Repentance' as in l. 4, or had a title of its own.

57. $\iota\epsilon$: the vestiges suit ϵ rather better than θ , which is the only alternative (cf. l. 56, note), and the 15th being a Sunday is wanted either here or in l. 56. If it came in l. 56, the suggested explanation of the paragraphi would still apply, perhaps even better; but a *σύναξις* on Mecheir 19 would be on a Thursday, whereas in ll. 59-68 the evidence, so far as it goes, points to *συνάξεις* on Saturdays and Sundays only. Mecheir 15 is in the mediaeval and modern Coptic calendars the day of St. Papnuthius, a well-known saint who had a church or monastery at Aphrodito (P. Brit. Mus. 1420. 204), so that ἡμέρα Παπνουθίου may have superseded *κυριακή*; cf. l. 10. Other saints venerated by the Copts on this day, St. Primus, patriarch of Alexandria (*ob.* about 120), the prophet Zachariah, and the forty martyrs of Sebastia, are less likely to have been mentioned.

58-9. On the omission of the week-days from Monday to Friday see p. 30. Mecheir 21 in the Coptic calendars is the day of SS. Basil, Peter, bishop of Damascus, Peter, patriarch of Alexandria (*ob.* 311), amba Gabriel, bishop of Alexandria, amba Zacharias, bishop, and Onesimus, disciple of St. Paul. The last may have been mentioned in l. 58 (ἡμέρα Ὀνησίμου), or ἄ[γι(ον)] Ὀνήσιμον is possible in l. 59.

60. κ[β]: a Sunday is wanted here and *εἰς τὸν αὐτόν* implies that the day is the next after Saturday, Mecheir 21; cf. ll. 8-9, 11-12, and 24-32 with 35-6, where there is an interval of a week and the name of the church is repeated. On Mecheir 22 the mediaeval Coptic calendars mention SS. Pamphilus and Porphyrius, and bishop Marutha, martyr under Diocletian, the modern one St. Isidorus, martyr under Decius, and bishop Maronius (fourth century).

61-2. On the first of these two days, which are consecutive (cf. l. 60, note), a saint's

day was probably recorded; cf. e. g. ll. 11-12. The second is almost certainly Mecheir 29, for that Sunday is wanted in ll. 61-2, and though the doubtful κ in l. 62 might be λ there is a vestige of another letter, which suits the cross-bar of θ . Line 61 therefore probably refers to Mecheir 28 (Feb. 22), a Saturday; cf. p. 30. The Coptic calendars mention St. Theodorus son of Romanus, martyr under Diocletian, a well-known saint, on that day, and *ἡμέρα Θεοδώρου* is possible in spite of the fact that the service was at the Southern church, for the St. Theodorus whose church is mentioned in l. 65 and possibly in l. 63 seems to be different. The Menol. Basil. mentions on Feb. 22 St. Athanasius, whom the Copts commemorate on Pachon 7 and sometimes on Thoth 30, and on Mecheir 29 (Feb. 23) both Greek and Coptic churches, as well as the Syriac calendar of 411, commemorate St. Polycarp, who may have been mentioned in l. 62 (*ἡμέρα Πολυκάρπου* instead of *κυριακή*).

63-6. On the restoration of the days in Phamenoth see pp. 30-1. St. Theodotus of Ancyra (l. 63, Phamenoth 6) was martyred in 304, and St. Theodorus of Pentapolis (l. 65, Phamenoth 13) about the same time. The latter is commemorated by the Copts on Epeiph 10 (so also Nau's calendar), as well as Phamenoth 12. The mediaeval Coptic calendars mention the Emperor Theodosius on Phamenoth 7, but that day is a Monday. The Greek Church on Phamenoth 6 (March 2) celebrates another Theodotus, bishop of Cyrenia in Cyprus (*ob.* about 324), Theodotus of Ancyra on June 7; and on March 9 (Phamenoth 13) both churches honour the forty martyrs of Sebastia in Armenia (fourth century?). There is no special difficulty in l. 63, which, if it is Phamenoth 6, can be restored either *Θεόδωρον ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ* or *Θεόδωρον κυριακή*, or, if it is not the 6th, is probably the 5th (a Saturday), in which case *Θεόδωρον ἡμέρα . . .* is likely, and l. 64 would then most probably refer to the 6th instead of the 12th. But a difficulty in any case arises in connexion with St. Theodorus in l. 65. A church of St. Theodorus at Arsinoë is known from e. g. P. Klein. Form. 164, and another at Antinoë from P. Cairo Maspero i. 67022. 18, but which of the numerous saints of that name is meant is not clear. Nau's and Tisserand's lists each mention about thirteen commemorations of St. Theodore, occurring in both on Thoth 11, Hathur 5, Tubi 12, Mecheir 28, Pachon 2 and 9, Pauni 6, and Epeiph 20, and in Nau's list on Hathur 20, Mecheir 7 and 13, Pauni 18, and Epeiph 9, in Tisserand's on Hathur 4, Choiak' 25, Mecheir 27, Phamenoth 21, Pharmouthi 5 and 7. The modern Coptic calendar according to Nilles celebrates, besides the bishop of Pentapolis, eight others, an obscure Th. with others on Thoth 9, Th. Orientalis on Tubi 12, the son of Romanus on Mecheir 28 (cf. ll. 61-2, note), the martyr with Timotheus on Phamenoth 21, the disciple of St. Pachomius on Pachon 2, the Alexandrian monk on Pauni 6, the bishop of Corinth on Epeiph 10, and the *στρατηλάτης* on Epeiph 20. Without *ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ* in l. 65 it would be quite uncertain which was meant, except that Th. Orientalis and Th. son of Romanus, whose days come within the period covered by Π , are unsuitable because their churches were not then visited. Since, however, two saints of this name have their days in Phamenoth, probably at least one of the two entries concerning *Θεο[* and *Θε[* refers to the celebration of the day of a St. Theodorus at his church. That ll. 63 and 65 refer to the two festivals of different saints called Theodorus on the 12th and 21st is improbable, because the 21st is not likely to have been reached so early as l. 65, and the bishop of Pentapolis is the only Theodorus whose festival need be considered. The objection to reading *ιβ* in l. 65 in accordance with the modern calendar is that, if l. 65 refers to a Saturday, l. 66 would naturally refer to the following Sunday, in which case l. 67, which is a day later than l. 66 (cf. l. 60, note), would be a Monday. Hence we prefer to avoid a violation of the directions of the Council of Laodicea, and to suppose that the festival of St. Theodorus was on the 13th (Sunday) instead of the 12th; cf. the similar variation in the case of the commemoration of Epimachus (pp. 26-7). Lines 66-7 then refer to the following Saturday and Sunday without difficulty, and l. 68 can refer to Easter Eve; cf. p. 31.

With regard to the two supposed Saturdays, Phamenoth 12 and 19 (ll. 64 and 66), the Coptic calendars commemorate on the first Joseph son of the patriarch Jacob, as well as St. Theodorus, and in the thirteenth–fourteenth century mention Demetrius, patriarch of Alexandria (*ob.* 232), and Malachias, martyr, and on the second Aristobulus (cf. l. 50, note; he is not in the mediaeval lists, which mention the power given to the disciples to bind and loose). The saints in the Greek calendar are unsuitable. For the 19th Ἀριστοβούλου is less likely than Κολλούθου, a well-known saint at this period (cf. e. g. P. Brit. Mus. 1460. 117), who in the Syriac calendar of 411 was celebrated on that day, though he is not in the modern calendar.

67. On Phamenoth 20 the Copts celebrate various martyrs of the period of Diocletian besides St. Athom.

68. The Virgin and St. Euphemia are the only two female saints mentioned in Π, but this entry may of course refer to a third; cf., however, p. 31. Possibly this service is to be connected with an ancient commemoration of the Virgin on Phamenoth 21 (Nau, *op. cit.* p. 200), but a *συναξίς* on a Monday in Lent would be contrary to the orders of the Council of Laodicea. The mediaeval Coptic calendars commemorate SS. Porphyrius, Apraxia, and Anatolius on Phamenoth 26, the modern one St. Sabinus of Hermopolis, Sadoch and 128 companions martyred under Sapor (341), and the prophet Hosea.

Additional note on l. 2.

With regard to the name of the *πάπας*, whom we have identified with Timotheus IV, the patriarch of Alexandria in 535 (p. 21), Mr. Crum suggests that Severus of Antioch may be meant. He was dethroned in 519 and appears to have spent the rest of his life in Egypt, his death taking place according to various authorities in 538, 539, or 542. For the monophysites, in Egypt at any rate, he was 'the patriarch' *par excellence*, and is so referred to occasionally without his name. The descent of the Alexandrian patriarch to his residence seems a somewhat inadequate point from which to date such a calendar as this, whereas no honour would be too much for Copts to pay to an incident connected with Severus, who has three distinct festivals in the *Synaxarium*. But whether Egyptians would refer to him as well as to the Alexandrian patriarch by the title *πάπας* is doubtful.

II. NEW CLASSICAL TEXTS

1358. HESIOD, *Catalogue*, BOOK iii.

Fr. 1 22.2 × 10.1 cm., Fr. 2 23.6 × 13 cm.

Third century.
Plate II (Fr. 2).

Some notable additions have been lately made by the papyri of Egypt to the surviving remains of the *Κατάλογος Γυναικῶν*, for which *Ἡοῖαι* seems to have been but another name (cf. Rzach in Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encycl.* viii. 1201 sqq.), ascribed in antiquity to Hesiod. Extensive fragments concerning the suitors of Helen have been published in *Berl. Klassikertexte*, V. 1. ii. 2-3, with smaller pieces relating to Meleager and Bellerophon (*ibid.* 1. 4), the latter of which is probably to be combined with 421 (cf. H. G. Evelyn-White in *Class. Quart.* vii, p. 217); a Strassburg papyrus deals with Peleus and Thetis (ed. Reitzenstein, *Hermes*, xxxv, pp. 79 sqq.), and texts at Florence with Atalanta and Alcmena (P. S. I. 130, 131); the former of these heroines is also the subject of a scrap in the Petrie papyri (I. iii. 3). Further evidence of the popularity which this portion of the Hesiodic corpus evidently enjoyed is now provided by the following considerable fragments from the third book of the *Catalogue* (cf. Fr. 2. 9, note) and by 1359, in which the heroines Auge and Electra figure.

1358 consists of two good-sized pieces, apparently having no direct connexion with each other. Their recto is inscribed with third-century official accounts, each fragment containing parts of two columns of which only the ends and beginnings of lines are preserved. In Fr. 2 Col. i the entry διὰ πρα(κτόρων) ε (ἔτους) λημ(μάτων) ε (ἔτους) (δραχμαὶ) Ἄριγ occurs, and in Col. ii the Oxyrhynchite villages of Μοῦμιον and Μερμέρθα are mentioned in separate paragraphs. The literary text on the verso may be referred with probability to the latter part of the same century. It is written in a slightly sloping uncial hand of rather large size and handsome appearance. Some corrections have been introduced in another, though not very dissimilar, writing, and this second hand may well be the source of the stops, accents, and other signs (except the diaeresis), but there is practically no difference in the colour of the ink. The acute accents are inclined at an unusually sharp angle to the line of writing and are sometimes even horizontal. Stops occur in all three positions, but do not appear to have been used with any real discrimination of values. From photographs kindly supplied by Prof. Vitelli it is clear that this hand is not the same as that of either P. S. I. 130 or 131, which were also obtained from Oxyrhynchus.

The subject of the two fragments is quite different, and their order is uncertain. Fr. 1 contains the ends of thirty-two lines from the upper part of a column, with slight remains of the column succeeding. The first fourteen lines of Col. i give the story of Europa, which was known to have been treated by Hesiod from the scholia on Homer, M 292 (Hesiod, Fr. 30), and will readily admit of an approximate restoration. In the lower portion of the column the allusions leave little room for doubt that the adventures were described of one of the sons of Zeus and Europa, Sarpedon, and that the writer identified him with the Sarpedon of the *Iliad*. This identification was already implied by the Homeric scholia cited above, e. g. Schol. T, *l. c.* 'Ἡσίοδος δὲ Εὐρώπης καὶ Διὸς αὐτόν (sc. Σαρπ.) φησι (cf. Schol. Eurip. *Rhes.* 29), and Immisch has noted that traces of it may be seen in Homer (Roscher, *Lexicon*, iv. 403), in spite of Z 198-9 and the remark of Aristonicus thereon (Schol. A, *ad loc.*) καθ' Ὁμηρον Σαρπηδῶν υἱὸς Εὐρώπης οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲ ἀδελφὸς Μίνωος, ὡς οἱ νεώτεροι· καὶ γὰρ οἱ χρόνοι εὐδήλοιοι. A like tradition was followed by Aeschylus (Nauck, *Trag. Fr.* 99), and the author of the *Rhesus* (l. 29), probably also by Bacchylides (Schol. A, Homer, M 292); cf. Hygin. *Fab.* 106, where the Sarpedon slain by Patroclus is called *Iovis et Europae filium*. Chronological difficulties were evaded by a legend that the hero's life was supernaturally prolonged: καὶ αὐτῷ δίδωσι Ζεὺς ἐπὶ τρεῖς γενεὰς ζῆν says Apollodorus iii. 1. 2. Others distinguished two Sarpedons, the son of Europa, and the Sarpedon of the *Iliad* who according to Z 198-9 (cf. Apollod. iii. 1. 1. 3) was the son of Zeus and Laodamia, while another account made his parents Euandrus son of the first Sarpedon and Deidamia (Diodor. v. 79. 3). Since the agreement of the poet of the *Catalogue* with the Homeric account of Sarpedon seems to have been in other respects rather close (cf. notes on ll. 23, 25-8), his divergence on the point of genealogy is the more remarkable. It should perhaps be noted in this connexion that according to the statement of Schol. A on Z 119 (Aristonicus) the position in the *Iliad* of the Glaucus episode, in which alone the mother of Sarpedon is named, was regarded as insecure.

In the second fragment there are again remains of two columns, though those of the second are so slight as to be practically negligible. Of Col. i, as opposed to the main column of the preceding fragment, the top is lost while the end is preserved, but it is hardly likely that more than a few verses are entirely missing. The gap at the beginnings of the lines is fortunately slighter than in Fr. 1, but restoration is nevertheless a matter of considerable difficulty. To some extent obscurity may be due to a faulty text. Some errors have been corrected, and in one place a whole line which had been originally omitted has been inserted; but in l. 31, at least, no construction seems obtainable as the text stands. The key to the subject of the whole passage seems to be given in

ll. 28 sqq., which describe an extended flight and pursuit of certain females apparently through the air. Following a suggestion of Mr. T. W. Allen, to whom we owe a number of contributions to the reconstruction of 1358 and 1359, we suppose the pursuit to be that of the Harpies by the Boreadae. There is good reason to believe that this subject was treated in the third book (cf. Hesiod, Frs. 52-9); and that that book is the source of the present fragments is clear from the references to the Κατουδαῖοι and Πυγμαῖοι in ll. 9 and 18; cf. the note on l. 9. In Hesiod, Fr. 54, the story of Phineus and the Harpies is said to have occurred ἐν τῇ καλουμένῃ γῆς περιόδῳ, but this is probably the appropriate name of that section of the book containing the account of the voyage of the Argonauts, in which the story of Phineus was an episode (cf. Rzach in Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encycl.* viii. 1205-6). From the similarity in phraseology between l. 20 and l. 28 it may be inferred that in l. 20 also the Boreadae are the subject; and this being granted, the construction of l. 15 (= Hesiod, Fr. 55) is hardly to be explained unless that line is one of a series specifying the various peoples and places passed by the Harpies and their pursuers; cf. ll. 25-6. We are thus carried back to l. 9 in which the Κατουδαῖοι and Πυγμαῖοι are mentioned and to which l. 18 must be a retrospective reference. Hence it would appear that the whole of this column was a description of the flight, the chief points on the route being given with parenthetical explanations and amplifications.

Fr. I.

Col. i.	Col. ii.
[. ε]περησε δ' ρ' αλμυρον ὕδωρ	× [
[.] Δίος δμηθείσα δολοισι	. [
[την ρα λαθων ηρπαξέ] πατηρ και δωρον εδωκεν	? [
[ορμον οι χρυσειον ον Η]φαιστος κλυτοτεχνης	? [
5 [ποιησεν ποτ αγαλμα ιδυί]ησιν πραπίδεσσι[[ν]]	. .
[και κτεανον πορε πατρι] φερων· ο δ εδεξατο δωρο[ν	About
[αυτος δ αρ δωκεν κουρη]ι Φοινικ[ο]ς αγανου.	15 lines
	lost.
[αυταρ επει ουτω τ]ηλε τανισφύρωι Ευρωπ[ι]ηι [
[μιχθη ρ εν φιλοτητι] πατηρ ανδρων τε θεω[ν τε	
10 [αυτις επει απεβη νυ]μφης παρα καλλικόμο[οιο	
[η δ αρα παιδας ετικτ]εν ὕπερμενείῃ Κρον[ιωι	
[κυδαλιμους ευηφε]νέων ηγητορας ανδ[ρων	
[Μινω τε κρειοντα] δίκαιόν τε Ραδαμαν[θην	

	[και Σαρπηδονα διον] αμυμονα τε κρατερ[ον τε	
15	[τοισιν εας τιμας δι]εθ[ά]σσατο μητιετα Ζ[ευσ	
	[ητοι ο μεν Λυκίης ευρ]έιης ἴφι ανασσε	
	[. πό]λεις εὔ ναιεταωσας [
	[. πολ]λή δ ἔοι εσπετο τιμηι	
	[. μεγαλη]τορι ποιμενι λαων. . [
20	[.] . μεροπων ανθρωπων	20
	[.] λατο μητίετα Ζευσ.	ωρ[
	[. πολ]υν δ εκρινατο λαον.	αιρ[
	[. Τρ]ωεσσ' επικουρους·	με[
	[.] πολεμοιο δαήμων.	αρ[
25	[. επ αριστ]ερα σήματα φαινων	25
	[. Ζευσ] αφθιτα μηδεα ειδως.	π . [
	[.] ατοι αμφιβαλόυσαις	ελθ[
	[.] Διοθεν τερας ηεν.	ενδ[
	[. Εκτ]ορος ανδροφονοιο	ζη[
30	[.] δε κηδε εθηκε.	εις θρ[
	[25 letters]ς Αργει[ο]ισι.	30
	[31 "]κα[και . [

Fr. 2. Plate II.

Col. i.

Col. i

	[.] γ[
	[.] κν[
	[.] ώντ[
	[.] τ · χ[
5	[.] αοδ[
	[.] εσπε[.] ηνοσ[
	[.] επα[.] κερ[
	[.] ' επι εργα· και η[
	[. . . . Κατουδ]άιων· και Πυγ[μαιων
10	[. . . . απε]ιρεσιων μελάνο[
	[.] ν]] τεκε Γαια πελω[ρη

- [.]ας τε πανομφάιο[υ Διὸς
 [.]οφρα θεοισιν ὑφε[ιμ]ενοι ατασ[θωσ]ιν []
 [.]των μεν τε νοος [γλ]ωσσης καθ[υπ]ερθεν.
 15 [Αιθιοπας] τε Λιβυς τε ἴδε Σκυ[θ]ας ἱππημο[λγου]ς
 [.]γενεθ' υἱὸς ὑπερ[μ]ενεος Κρονιωνος.
 [.] μελανες τε και Αι[θ]ιοπες μέγαθυμοι
 [ηδε Κατου]δαιοι και Πυγμαί[οι] αμηνηνοι
 [οι παντες] κρειοντος Ερικτυπου εισι γενεθλη
 20 [και τουτου]ς περι κυκλ[ω]ι εθνεον αἰσσοντες
 [.]νεαμ . [. . . Ἰ]περβορεων εὐἱππων.
 [ους τεκε Γη] φερβουσα π[ολ]υσπερέας πολυφορβος
 [τηλε παρ Ηριδανο]ο βα[θυρρ]ου αιπα ρεεθρα.
 [.]πρ . [.] ηλεκτροιο. . . .
 25 [Νεβρωδες τ ορος] αιπυ κ[αι Αιτυ]ην παιπαλοεσσαν. . / []
 [.]τ Ορτυγινην Δαιστ[ρυγον]ιην τε γενεθλην. []
 [ενθα Ποσει]δάωνος ερισθ[ε]νέος γένεθ' υἱὸς. . []
 [την παρα δ]ις πόλεσαν· π[ε]ρι τ' αμφι τε κυκλώσαντο. . []
 [ιεμενοι] μαρψαι· ται δ εκφυγέειν και αλυξαι· . []
 30 [εσ τε Κεφαλλ]ηνων αγερώχων φῦλον ὀρουσαν. . . .
 [.]Ποσει]δαωνι Καλυψω ποτνια νυμφη·
 θοροντες·
 [.]γαῖαν Αρητιάδαο ἀνακτος·
 [.]α κλύον· αλλ αρα και τάς κατ(ω)
 [.]ν δια τ' αιθερος ατρυγετοιο
 35 [.]μετα]χρονοιοισι ποδεσσι αν(ω)

Fr. 1. i. 3-16. 'Her then father Zeus carried off by stealth, and gave her as a gift the golden necklace which Hephaestus, famed for his art, once made for a delight with cunning mind, and brought and gave in possession to father Zeus; and he received the gift with gladness: this gave he to the daughter of proud Phoenix. But when the father of gods and men had thus been mated in love afar off with Europa of slender ankles, he went away again from the fair-tressed maiden. And she bore to the almighty son of Cronus glorious sons, princes of wealthy men, lord Minos and just Rhadamanthus and godlike Sarpedon, blameless and powerful, to whom Zeus in his wisdom apportioned their honour. Sarpedon ruled in might over broad Lycia . . .'

4-5. Cf. Apollod. iii. 4. 2 τὸν ἠφαιστότευκτον ὄρμον, ὃν ὑπὸ Ἐφαιστου λέγουσιν τινες δοθῆναι Κάδμῳ, Φερεκίδης δὲ ὑπὸ Εὐρώπης ὃν παρὰ Διὸς αὐτὴν λαβεῖν. For ἰδυ]ησι cf. e. g.

Homer, Υ 12 Ἡφαιστος ποιήσεν ἰδυίησι πραπίδεσσι. What has been taken as remains of an acute accent may be part of a diaeresis. The rest of the supplement in l. 5 is prompted by Suidas, s. v. ἀγάλματα, . . . καὶ Ἡσίοδος τὸν ὄρμον ἀγαλμα καλεῖ (Hesiod, Fr. 233). As an alternative θαῦμα ἰδεῖν ποιήσῃ may be suggested, and this would perhaps be somewhat better adapted to the lacuna, which is of the same size as in the two preceding and following lines.

7. κουρή]ε Φοινικ[ο]ς: so Homer, Ξ 321 Φοίνικος κούρης.

8. τ]ηλε is quite doubtful; the λ may be α, δ, or μ, and this is preceded by remains of, apparently, a vertical stroke. καθε]υδε would suit the context, but a υ is unsatisfactory. Εὐρώπεια has been regarded as a late form (cf. Lobeck, *Paral.* p. 321), but is now shown to be of the same age as Εὐρώπη (first in *Theog.* 357). That the inserted ε is due to the corrector is not certain. For τανίσφυρος instead of τανύσφ. cf. Bacchyl. iii. 60, v. 59.

12. ευηφε]ρευων, for which cf. Homer, Ψ 81, was suggested by Allen. ερισθε]ρευων or μεγαλοσθε]ρευων would also be suitable.

15-16. The supplement suggested in l. 15 is based on *Theog.* 885 δ δὲ τοῖσιν εἰς (Rzach with Ahrens, εῖ MSS., εὐ Heinsius) διεδάσασατο τιμάς. After ανασσε in l. 16 there is before the break a blank space (in which a stop is possibly to be recognized), so that ανασσε]ιν depending on e. g. μοῖραν ἐδάσασατο or διεδάσασατο (cf. *Theog.* 520 ταύτην γὰρ οἱ μοῖραν ἐδάσασατο μητίετα Ζεὺς) is excluded. Λυκίης εὐρείης occurs in Homer, Ζ 173, 188, Π 455, &c.

18. l. δε βι, and this was perhaps intended, the accentuator being rather careless about the position of his marks; cf. note on l. 21.

21. A horizontal stroke above the first τ of μητιετα is probably to be interpreted as an acute accent intended for the next letter.

23. Cf. Homer, Μ 101 Σαρπηδῶν δ' ἠγήσατ' ἀγακλειτῶν ἐπικούρων.

25-8. The remains of these lines look very like a description of the portent which in the *Iliad* precedes the death of Sarpedon, Π 459-60 αἱματοέσσας δὲ ψιάδας κατέχευεν ἔραζε παῖδα φίλον τιμῶν; cf. Hesiod, *Scut.* 384-5 κὰδ δ' ἄρ' ἀπ' οὐρανόθεν ψιάδας βάλεν αἱματοέσσας σῆμα τιθεῖς πολέμοιο ἐφ' μεγαθαρσεί παιδί. It does not, however, seem possible to read αμ]ματος in l. 27, though the ι is not certain and γ or perhaps τ could be substituted. The final s of αμφιβαλουσαις also is very faint, and the slight vestiges might be taken for a stop, but the accent would then be wrong. Ζεὺς ἀφθιτα μῆδεα εἰδώς occurs in *Theog.* 545, 550, &c.

ii. 1. It is not clear whether the small cross in the upper margin here is the initial letter (χ) of an adscript or a critical symbol as e. g. 1231. Fr. 32. ii; cf. 1361. Fr. 5. ii. There may also have been some insertion immediately above or below l. 1; the vestiges are hardly to be accounted for by any single letter.

29. εις θρ]: or perhaps εκ τρ]. The first letter is really more like σ than ε.

Fr. 2. i. 9. Cf. l. 18 and Philod. Περὶ Εὐσεβ. 10 οὐ]δ' Ἡσιόδα μῆ τ[ις ἐ]ν[γ]ελά δς γ[. . . .] αιο[. . .] ἢ [καὶ τ]ῶν Κατουδα[ίων κ]αὶ τῶν Πυ[γμα]λαίων μνημονεύει, Harpocration i. 296. 7 (so Suidas and Photius) s. v. ὑπὸ γῆν οἰκοῦντες, λέγοι ἂν . . . καὶ τοὺς ὑπὸ Ἡσιόδου ἐν γ' Καταλόγου Κατουδαίους ὀνομαζομένους (Hesiod, Fr. 60), Strabo i, p. 43 (cf. vii, p. 299) Ἡσιόδου δ' οὐκ ἂν τις αἰτιάσαιτο ἄγνοιαν Ἡμίκωνας λέγοντος καὶ Μακροκεφάλους καὶ Πυγμαίους, Harpocration i. 197. 10 s. v. Μακροκέφαλοι, ἔθνος ἐστὶν οὕτω καλούμενον οὐ καὶ Ἡσίοδος μέμνηται ἐν γ' γυναικῶν Καταλόγῳ (Hesiod, Fr. 62). The line might be completed with ἀμενήνων, as in l. 18.

10-14. The reference in this obscure passage, as Murray suggests, is perhaps to the δῆμος ὀνειρών (Homer, ω 12, φύλον ὀνειρών Hesiod, *Theog.* 212). They are placed by Homer, l. c., in the neighbourhood of the Ἡελίοιο πύλαι beyond the Ὠκεανοῦ ῥοαί and Λευκὰς πέτρη, and so could well be named after the Πυγμαῖοι, who, according to Homer, Γ 5-6, lived near the Ὠκεανοῖο ῥοαί; the Ethiopians and Libyans (l. 15) might indeed be expected to precede

rather than follow, but since these are coupled with the Scythians it is clear that the topography is somewhat vague. In Hesiod, *l. c.*, the mother of the *φῦλον ὀνείρων* is Νύξ, but Euripides calls them sons of Earth in *I. T.* 1263 and *Hec.* 70 *πότνια χθών, μελανοπτερύγων μάτερ ὀνείρων*: with the epithet *μελανοπτερύγων* cf. *μελάνο* in *l. 10*. Lines 13–14 may be explained as alluding to the substitution of the articulate prophecy of Apollo for prognostication by dreams, as described in Eurip. *I. T.* 1259 sqq. On these lines the passage may be tentatively restored:—

[εἴτ' ἐπ' ἀπε]ιρεσίω^ν μελάνο[. . . δῆμον ὀνείρων
[τοὺς] τέκε Γαῖα πελώ[ρη θυμοσόφους τε
[μαντοσύν]ας τε πανομφαίο[υ Διὸς εἰδότας αἴση,
[κωφούς δ', εἴ]φρα θεοῖσιν ὑφε[ιμ]ένοι ἀτασ[θῶσ]ιν
[μαντείαις] τῶν μὲν τε κτλ.

If the accent on *μελάνο* is right, only one syllable is wanting; otherwise *μελανόπτερον ὄχλον* would be suitable.

11. *Γαῖα πελώρη* occurs several times in the *Theogony*, e.g. 159, 173. But perhaps *πελώριος*, which is found as a fem. form in *Theog.* 179, was here used.

12. *πανομφαῖος* is an epithet of Zeus in Homer, *Θ* 250.

13. A dark mark on the edge of the papyrus before *φρα* does not look like an accent. *ατασ[θῶσ]ιν*, if right, is remarkable, the verb being used elsewhere in the present tense only. *αταλ[λῶσ]ιν* (cf. Hesiod, *Op.* 131) cannot be read.

15. This line = Hesiod, Fr. 55, from Strabo vii, p. 300 'Ἡσίοδος μάρτυς ἐν τοῖς ὑπ' Ἐρατοσθένους παρατεθείσιν ἔπεσιν Αἰθιοπίας κτλ. The MSS. of Strabo have *τε λιγυστὶ δέ*, which has been variously emended: *Δίγυάς τε ἰδέ* Naeke, *Δίγυάς τ' ἡδέ* Heinsius, *τε Δίγυς τ' ἡδέ* Bernhardy, *τὲ Δίγυς τε ἰδέ* Rzach, *Δίβυάς τ' ἡδέ* Clericus, *τε Δίβυς τ' ἡδέ* Osann, none of these quite coinciding with the reading of the papyrus, which may be accepted as correct. A mark like a very short grave accent above the *ε* of the first *τε* seems to be meaningless.

16–19. These lines apparently trace the origin of the *Αἰθιοπες* and others who had just been mentioned (ll. 9, 15) from Zeus, who rather than Poseidon is presumably meant, as usual, by *Κρονίωνος*; cf. *l. 19* Ἐρικτύπου, which though an epithet of Poseidon in *Theog.* 441, 456, 930 would more naturally refer to Zeus when used independently. The fact that Poseidon is twice named below (ll. 27, 31) is hardly a reason for supposing that he was intended here. Line 16 may be restored, with Murray, [*ὄν ἄρ' ἄναξ*; or possibly there was a mention of Epaphus, as Mr. Lobel suggests; he is described as the father of Libya in Aesch. *Suppl.* 315–16, Apollod. ii. 1. 4, &c. Line 17 might then be completed [*τοιοῦ Λιβυς*]. Murray proposes [*Κολλοὶ γαρ*]; they were *μελάγχροες* according to Hdt. ii. 104. In the absence of corroborative evidence it seems hardly likely that *μελανες* is to be taken as a proper name here, though the position of *τε* would suit this. For the superfluous iota adscript in *l. 19* cf. *l. 31*.

20. The poet here returns to the Boreadae and Harpies, who are apparently the subject of *εθνεον*; cf. *l. 28*. *θυνεῖν* is a form peculiar to Hesiod.

21. Mr. Allen suggests that the name *Φίνεα* stood here, but it seems very difficult to obtain a satisfactory completion of the line on that hypothesis. For the Hyperboreans cf. Hdt. iv. 32 ἀλλ' Ἡσιόδῳ μὲν ἐστὶ περὶ Ὑπερβορέων εἰρημένα (Hesiod, Fr. 209), Steph. Byz. s. v. Ἡμίκυρες, ἔθνος οὐ πύρρω Μασσαγετῶν καὶ Ὑπερβορέων . . . καὶ Ἡσίοδος (Fr. 62). They were perhaps mentioned here as the starting-point of the chase.

22. We regard this and the two following verses as a parenthetical amplification of Ὑπερβορέων analogous to the genealogy of the *Αἰθιοπες*, &c., in ll. 16 sqq. For *τεκε Γη* cf. *l. 11* above, and for the collocation *π[ολ]υσπ. πολυφ.*, Homer, *I* 154 *πολύρρηγες πολυβούται*, *K* 315 *πολύχρυσος πολύχαλκος. πολύφορβος*, which may be a mistake for *πολυφορβους*, is an epithet of Demeter in *Theog.* 912 and of *γαῖα* in Homer, *I* 568, &c.

23-4. The restoration of Ἡριδανοί]ο here (Allen) is commended by ηλεκτροίο in the following line. The Eridanus is mentioned in *Theog.* 338, and that the myth of the Heliades occurred in Hesiod was known from Fr. 199. The view that in its earliest form that story was connected with the Hyperboreans had already been taken by Preller, *Griech. Myth.* i, p. 358; cf. Hdt. iii. 115 Ἡριδανόν τινα . . . ποταμὸν ἐκδιδόντα ἐς θάλασσαν τὴν πρὸς βορέην ἄνεμον, *Ap. Rhod. Arg.* iv. 611-14 Κελτοὶ δ' ἐπὶ βάξιν ἔθεντο, ὡς ἄρ' Ἀπόλλωνος τάδε δάκρυα Λητοῖδαο συμφέρεται δίναις (sc. Ἡριδανού), ἃ τε μυρία χεῦε πάροιθεν, ἦμος Ὑπερβορέων ἱερὸν γένος εἰσαφίκαεν. Whether the interlinear addition in l. 24 is due to the corrector or to the original scribe is not very clear.

25-6. Νεβρωδες was suggested by Lobel. The construction is awkward, though apparently not more so than at l. 15. For Αἰτυ]ην and Ο]ρτυγιην cf. Strabo i, p. 23 (Hes. Fr. 65) Ἐρατοσθένης δὲ Ἡσίοδον μὲν εἰκάζει . . . πιστεύσαντα τῇ δόξῃ μὴ μόνον τῶν ὑφ' Ὀμήρου λεγομένων μεμνήσθαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ Αἴτνης καὶ Ὀρτυγίας τοῦ πρὸς Συρακούσας νησίου καὶ Τυρρηνῶν. In l. 26 νησον is an obvious supplement, but is scarcely long enough for the lacuna; possibly [νησον ἐπ Ο]ρτ. was written. Murray proposes στυφλην.

27. υἱος: i. e. probably Laestrygon, who is called the son of Poseidon in Eustath. p. 1649. 10; cf. Gellius, *N. A.* 15. 21 *Neptuni filios dixerunt . . . Laestrygonas*. Polyphemus could hardly have been referred to in such vague terms. In place of ενθα perhaps os τε might be restored, sc. Δαιστρυγῶν, supplied from Δαιστ[ρυγον]ιην.

θ of γενεθ was converted from a τ.

28. πολεῖν means 'to plough' in *Op.* 462, but must here mean 'range over' if, as is the natural assumption, the Boreadae are the subject.]ις might also be e. g. τρις with ἐπι or ἀρα or μεν preceding.

29. Cf. *Scut.* 231 ἰέμεναι μαπέειν, of the Gorgons, and 304 ἰέμενοι μαπέειν, οἱ δ' ἰέμενοι ὑπαλύξαι, of hunters and hares.

30. Κεφαλλ]ηνων well suits the geography, the Στροφάδες or Πλωταί, where the pursuit ended, being placed to the south of Zacynthus; cf. l. 32 and Schol. Laur. *Apoll. Rhod. Arg.* ii. 297 ὅτι δὲ ἠῦξαντο οἱ περὶ Ζήτην τῷ Διὶ στραφέντες λέγει καὶ Ἡσίοδος "Ενθ' οἱ γ' εὐχέσθην Αἰνιῶ ὑψιμέδοντι (Fr. 57) ἔστι γὰρ Αἶνος ὄρος τῆς Κεφαλληνίας, ὅπου Αἰνισίου Διὸς ἱερόν ἐστίν.

31. It seems impossible to obtain any connexion for this verse, since only a trochee is missing and a verb is demanded by the nominative Καλυψω κτλ. An aposiopesis analogous to *Theocr.* i. 105 οὐ λέγεται τὰν Κύπριν ὁ βουκόλος; is unsuited to the Hesiodic style; and the stop after νυμφηι invalidates a transference of the verb to the beginning of the next line. Probably, then, either something has dropped out, as at l. 33 (e. g., as Mr. Lobel suggests, δῆμον Ὀδυσσῆος ταλασίφρονος, ὃν μετέπειτα εἶργε Ποσ. κτλ.), or the verse is out of its place, which is perhaps the more likely alternative, if θοροντες in the margin implies that a participle preceded γ]αῖαν in l. 32.

32. γ]αῖαν Ἀρητιάδαο: i. e. presumably Dulichium; cf. Homer, π 395-6 Νίσου φαίδιμος υἱός, Ἀρητιάδαο ἀνακτος, ὅς ῥ' ἐκ Δουλιχίου κτλ. A reference to the Thessalian Cycnus, who is called Ἀρητιάδης in *Scut.* 57 (cf. *Apollod.* ii. 7. 7), does not suit this context.

33. Possibly the supposed ῖ belongs to the interlinear insertion. κατ(ω) at the end of the line calls attention to the verse which has fallen out and been subsequently supplied at the bottom of the column; cf. e. g. 700. 27, 852. Fr. 1. ii. 8, Fr. 64. 57, 1232. ii. 3.

35. This verse, which was originally omitted, follows l. 33; see the preceding note. For μετα]χρονοιοισι, which was restored by Allen, cf. *Theog.* 269.

ii. 1. The marginal sign (cf. e. g. 16) is presumably due to the corrector,

1359. HESIOD, *Catalogue*.

Fr. I 15 × 7.7 cm. Early third century. Plate III
(Frs. 2 and 4).

The authorship of the following fragments is not established like that of 1358 by coincidences with extant Hesiodica, but will nevertheless hardly be questioned. Their subject is clearly well-known heroines of Greek mythology, whose stories with those of their descendants are narrated just in the manner of the Hesiodic *Κατάλογος Γυναικῶν*. Fr. 1, the only substantial piece, is occupied with the adventures of Auge and her son Telephus. Fr. 2, from l. 5, where the transition to a new subject is marked by a paragraphus, relates to Electra, daughter of Atlas, and her descendants. If *Εριχθονίοιο* is to be restored in Fr. 4. 3, that fragment would be expected to be concerned with the same family as Fr. 2; ll. 5-8, however, apparently relate to Diomedes and Hyacinthus, who were not connected with the Dardanidae.

The MS. is neatly written in a small, slightly sloping book-hand of a common type, and may be roughly dated about the year A.D. 200. Accents and other diacritical signs, probably also the punctuation, are secondary, as is evident from the colour of the ink, and may be credited to the corrector who has made occasional small alterations in the text.

Fr. I.

.
[.] γ[
[. 18 letters . . .] . [.] δ[.] ε . [.] . . [. .] υθ . δ[εναθα[.] . [.]
[ει δη ρ η] μ[ελλ]εν τε και ει διε μ[υθον] ακουσαι
5 [αθανα]των ὅι οι το^τ[ι] εναργεες αντεφανησ[αν
[κεινη]ν δ' [ε]ν μεγαροισιν εὔ τρεφεν ηδ' ατ[ιταλλε
[δεξαμ]εν[ο]ς [[ε]]ῖσον δε θυγατρασιν ἧσιν ετιμ[α
[η τεκε] Τηλεφον Αρκασίδην Μῦσῶν βασιλη[α
[μιχθε]ισ εν φιλοτητι βίη Ηρακληειη·
10 [ος ρα μεθ ι]ππους στειχεν αγανου Λαομεδοντο[ς
[οι δη ποσσι]ν αριστοι εν Ασ[ί]δι έτραφεν α'η·
[εκ δ ο γ Αμαζον]ιδων μεγαθυμων φυλον εναιρ[ε

[μαρναμενος κ]εινης δε τε γης εξηλασε πάσης [
 [αυταρ ο Τηλεφος] έτραπ' Αχαιων χαλκοχιτων[ων
 15 [ασπιστας και εβησ]ε μελαινάων επι ν[ηων
 [αυταρ επει πολλους] πελασεν χθονι βω[τιανειρη
 [αυτου δη δεδμητ]ο βιη τ' ανδροκτασιη τ[ε
 [.]η κατοπισθεν ε[
 [.] . ως δ' ικοντο θ[
 20 [.] πεφοβημενο[
 [.] . ετο κλυτος αρ[
 [.]ε δια κλε[. .] . [
 [.] . [
 [.]κλυτ[
 25 [.]να[

Fr. 2. Plate III.

.
 ε . [
 κ[
 . . [
 και μ[
 5 Ηλεκτρ[η
 γειναθ' [υποδηθεισα κελαινεφει Κρονιωνι
 Δαρδαν[ον
 Ηετιων[α τε
 ος ποτε Δ[ημητρος μεγ ερασσατο καλλικομοιο
 10 και τον μ[εν φλογερω δαμασεν πληχθεντα κεραυνω
 Ηετιωνα [χολωσαμενος νεφεληγερετα Ζευσ
 ουνεκα Δ[ημητρ ηυκομω επι χειρας εβαλλεν
 αυταρ Δα[ρδανος ηλθεν επ ακτην ηπειροιο
 εκ του Ερ[ιχθονιος και Τρωσ μετεπειτα γενοντο
 15 Ιλος [τ Ασσαρακος τε και αντιθεος Γανυμηδης
 νηϊ [πολυκληιδι λιπων ιερην Σαμοθρακην

Fr. 3.

. . .
 νοστ[ο]
 α[
 αίθ[ο . . .]
 . . .

Fr. 4. Plate III.

.]κλε[ο[
 ']δαο θύγατ[ρ
]χθονίοιο
] . καλλος ε[
 5 ευπλ]οκαμον Δ[ιομ]ηδ[ην
 η δ Υακινθον γεινατ αμν]μονά τε κρατερον τε
]α· τον ρα ποτ' αυτος
 Φοιβος κτανε νηλε]ϊ δισκω
]

Fr. 5.

.
] . [. . .
]ν γερας αφ[θιτον
]αιμον τει[
 δια χρυση]ν Αφροδι[την
 5] . κε γυν[αικ

Fr. 6.

.
] [. . .
]ν ἱκανεν
]ληες
]οιο
]

Fr. 7.

.
]ισ[
]δων[
 γ]ονήων· ηδ[
] κατ' αρ . [. . .

Fr. 1. 3. Perhaps *αθα[νατοις* (cf. l. 5), but the preceding remains do not combine well with this.

4-17. ' . . . if he delayed or feared to hear the word of the immortal gods who then appeared plainly to him. And he received and bred her up and tended her well in his halls, making her equal in honour with his daughters. And she was the mother of Telephus, of the stock of Arcas, king of the Mysians, after being mated in love with mighty Heracles, who went after the horses of proud Laomedon, the swiftest of foot bred in the land of Asia, and destroyed the race of the high souled Amazons in battle and drove them from all that land. Now Telephus put to flight the warriors of the brazen-coated Achaeans and made them

embark on their black ships. But when he had laid many low on mother earth, his death-dealing might was stricken . . .'

4-5. The reception of Auge by the Mysian king Teuthras seems here to have been attributed to a divine interposition. $\eta\muε[\lambda\lambda]εν$ is quite conjectural; the doubtful μ may be η , and there is barely room for the two lambdas. In l. 5 the supposed rough breathing on α is very uncertain, and a smooth one would be at least as consistent with the vestiges.

6. [$\kappaειη$] ν : sc. Auge; the subject is Teuthras.

7. Cf. Hyg. *Fab.* 99 *cum esset orbis liberis, hanc pro filia habuit*, and *Fab.* 100, where the story of the proposed marriage of Auge to Telephus is given. Another version represented Auge as having become the wife of Teuthras; cf. Pausan. viii. 4. 9, Apollod. ii. 7. 4.

8. *Αρκασιδην*: cf. Callim. *H. Dian.* 216, where the name is applied to Iasius, who like Telephus was of the fifth generation from Arcas.

11. Cf. Homer, Ψ 348 $\eta\ \tau\acute{o}\upsilon\varsigma\ \Delta\alpha\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma,\ \omicron\acute{\iota}\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\theta\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\ \gamma'\ \acute{\epsilon}\tau\rho\alpha\phi\epsilon\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\lambda\omicron\acute{\iota}.$

15. $\epsilon\beta\eta\sigma\epsilon$: cf. e. g. Homer, Π 810 $\phi\acute{\omega}\tau\alpha\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\acute{\iota}\kappa\omicron\sigma\iota\ \beta\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\phi'\ \acute{\iota}\pi\pi\omega\nu.$

16. Cf. the Homeric line $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\sigma\sigma\upsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \pi\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\sigma\epsilon\ \chi\theta\omicron\nu\acute{\iota}\ \pi\omicron\upsilon\lambda\upsilon\beta\omicron\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\eta$ (Θ 277, &c.). $\chi\theta\omicron\nu\acute{\iota}\ \beta\omicron\omega\tau\iota\alpha\nu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\eta$ occurs in *H. Apoll.* 363, *H. Ven.* 265.

17. $\delta\epsilon\delta\mu\eta\tau\]\omicron$ is extremely uncertain; the slight remains of the final vowel would be consistent with ϵ . Above the line at this point is an ink-mark which suggests a stop, but that can hardly have been intended here.

18. Possibly $\epsilon\beta\]\eta$, but the lacunae now become too large for satisfactory restoration.

19. The last word may well have been $\theta[\alpha\lambda\alpha\sigma\sigma\alpha\nu$, as both Murray and Allen suggest; the remains after the initial lacuna are consistent with $\theta\]\omicron\omega\varsigma$.

21. Perhaps $\text{Αρ}[\gamma\epsilon\iota\phi\omicron\nu\eta\tau\eta\varsigma$, as in Hesiod, *Op.* 84 $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\mu\pi\epsilon\ \pi\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\ \kappa\lambda\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \acute{\Lambda}\rho\gamma.$, but $\pi\epsilon\]\tau\epsilon\tau\omicron$, as in Homer, Ω 345 $\pi.\ \kappa\rho\alpha\tau\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma\ \acute{\Lambda}\rho\gamma.$, would be unsatisfactory, the vestige of the letter after the lacuna apparently not suiting τ .

22. Perhaps $\kappa\lambda\epsilon\]\tau\omicron\upsilon\acute{\omicron}$, the last vestige before the lacuna being part of the circumflex.

24. Cf. l. 21 and note.

Fr. 2. 5 sqq. Cf. Homer, Υ 215 sqq., Apollod. iii. 12. 1-2.

6. For the supplement cf. Hesiod, *Scut.* 53.

8-12. Cf. Homer, ϵ 125-8 $\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \delta'\ \acute{\omicron}\pi\acute{\omicron}\tau'\ \acute{\iota}\alpha\sigma\acute{\iota}\omega\nu\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\pi\lambda\acute{\omicron}\kappa\alpha\mu\omicron\varsigma\ \Delta\eta\mu\acute{\eta}\tau\eta\rho,\ \phi\acute{\iota}\ \theta\upsilon\mu\acute{\omega}\ \acute{\epsilon}\acute{\iota}\xi\alpha\sigma\alpha,\ \mu\acute{\iota}\gamma\eta\ \phi\iota\lambda\acute{\omicron}\tau\eta\tau\iota\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\ \nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\phi\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\iota\ \tau\rho\iota\pi\acute{\omicron}\lambda\phi\ \acute{\omicron}\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \delta\eta\nu\ \acute{\eta}\epsilon\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\upsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \text{Ze}\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma\ \acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ \mu\iota\nu\ \kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\phi\nu\epsilon\ \beta\alpha\lambda\acute{\omega}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\gamma\acute{\eta}\tau\iota\ \kappa\epsilon\rho\alpha\nu\nu\acute{\omega},$ Apollod. iii. 12. 1 $\acute{\iota}\alpha\sigma\acute{\iota}\omega\nu\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \acute{\omicron}\delta\acute{\nu}\ \acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\sigma\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \Delta\acute{\eta}\mu\eta\tau\rho\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega\nu\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\iota\sigma\chi\acute{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\iota\ \tau\acute{\eta}\nu\ \theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \kappa\epsilon\rho\alpha\nu\nu\acute{\omicron}\tau\alpha\iota.$ That Iasion was another name for Eetion is stated in Schol. Apollon. Rhod. i. 916 $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\eta\sigma\epsilon\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \tau\rho\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \pi\alpha\acute{\iota}\delta\alpha\varsigma,\ \Delta\acute{\alpha}\rho\delta\alpha\nu\omicron\nu\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\varsigma\ \text{T}\rho\omicron\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu\ \kappa\alpha\tau\omicron\acute{\iota}\kappa\eta\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\alpha,\ \acute{\omicron}\nu\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \text{Π}\omicron\lambda\upsilon\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\eta\nu\ \phi\alpha\sigma\acute{\iota}\ \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\ \acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{\omicron}\ \tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\chi\omega\rho\acute{\iota}\omega\nu,\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \acute{\eta}\epsilon\tau\acute{\iota}\omega\nu\alpha\ \acute{\omicron}\nu\ \acute{\iota}\alpha\sigma\acute{\iota}\omega\nu\alpha\ \acute{\omicron}\nu\omicron\acute{\mu}\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\ \acute{\kappa}\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \phi\alpha\sigma\iota\ \kappa\epsilon\rho\alpha\nu\nu\omega\theta\acute{\eta}\nu\alpha\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \acute{\upsilon}\beta\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\lambda\mu\alpha\ \tau\acute{\eta}\varsigma\ \Delta\acute{\eta}\mu\eta\tau\rho\varsigma.$ The scholiast's authority here is supposed to have been Hellanicus, who is cited in the context. The identity of Iasion with Eetion is also stated by Schol. Eurip. *Phoen.* 1129.

13-16. Cf. Apollod. iii. 12. 1 $\Delta\acute{\alpha}\rho\delta\alpha\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}\ \tau\acute{\omega}\ \theta\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\acute{\omicron}\upsilon\ \lambda\upsilon\pi\acute{\omicron}\upsilon\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \Sigma\alpha\mu\omicron\theta\rho\acute{\alpha}\kappa\eta\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\lambda\iota\pi\acute{\omega}\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \tau\acute{\eta}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\iota\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\ \acute{\eta}\pi\epsilon\iota\rho\omicron\nu\ \acute{\eta}\lambda\theta\epsilon.$ $\nu\eta\iota$ in l. 16 looks like a reference to the voyage of Dardanus (in spite of Conon 21 $\pi\lambda\acute{\omicron}\acute{\iota}\omega\nu\ \chi\rho\acute{\eta}\sigma\iota\varsigma\ \acute{\omicron}\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}\pi\omega\ \acute{\eta}\nu$), and if so it seems probable that ll. 14-15 are parenthetical. Tros was the son of Erichonius and father of Ilus, Assaracus, and Ganymede. For l. 15 cf. Homer, Υ 232.

Fr. 3 containing beginnings of lines may well belong to the same column as **Fr. 2**, but their relative position is unknown.

Fr. 4. 1-4. The subject of these verses is not clear. It is natural to restore $\text{Ερ}[\chi\theta\omicron\upsilon\iota\omicron]$ in l. 3 and to suppose that the fragment is more or less closely connected with **Fr. 2**,

and ll. 1-2 and 4 readily lend themselves to that view;]κλεο[in l. 1 may be Κλεο[πατρα daughter of Tros, and καλλος in l. 4 might be taken to refer to her brother Ganymede. On the other hand ll. 5-8 are apparently concerned with the quite different subject of Diomedes and Hyacinthus. Perhaps a new section began at l. 5.

5-8. Cf. Apollod. iii. 10. 3 Ἀμύκλα δὲ καὶ Διομήδης . . . Ὑάκινθος. τοῦτον εἶναι τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ἐρώμενον λέγουσιν, ὃν δίσκῳ βαλὼν ἄκων ἀπέκτεινε.]a in l. 7 might perhaps be Αμυκλ]α.

Fr. 5. 2. αφ[θιτον: cf. Homer, I 413 κλέος ἄφθιτον, *H. Cer.* 261 ἄφθ. . . . τιμήν. γέρας ἄφθ. occurs in Alcaeus, Fr. 83.

1360. ALCAEUS.

Late second century.

Since the publication of Part X some additional fragments of 1234 have fortunately come to light. One or two small pieces have fitted on to Fr. 1, lines 1-12 now reading as follows:—

· [.] · [. . .] ε[. .] · · [. . .]
 ου[. . . .] τάρει
 π[. . . .] ἄβολονπάτεραπ[. . .]
 κα[. . . .] νκήνωπατερα[. . .]
 5 το[. . . .] ωνάισχυντοσεπ[. . .]
 μ[. . .] σοσαλιτρον·
 ζευπατερ· λῦδοιμενεπα[. . .]
 συμφόραισι δισχελίοισστα[. . .]
 ἀμμέδωκανάικεδυνάιμεθ' ἱρ[. . .]
 10 εσπολινελθην·
 ουπάθοντεσουδάμαπῶσλονου[. . .]
 ουδεγεινώσκοντες· οἴωσαλώπα[. . .]

That a new poem begins at l. 7 is established by the coronis. συμφόραισι is another substantial gain, and ἄμμι, which we hesitated to restore, is confirmed. The first word of l. 6 was of course μῆσος, but the preceding verses remain obscure. It is disappointing that the gap at the beginning of them has not been more completely filled, but perhaps the missing fragment may yet make its appearance.

The remainder of the new pieces are printed below. Frs. 1-3 certainly, and probably Fr. 5 also, are from the bottoms of columns, but their position relatively to each other and to the columns of 1234 is unknown, and the assumption that

the latter were consecutive becomes rather more hazardous. In colour and condition, however, these additional fragments approximate to 1234. Fr. 1, and may well have preceded it. They cannot be brought into close connexion with 1234. Frs. 3-6.

As in 1234, political references are frequent, and the poems seem to belong mainly to the class of *Στασιωτικά*. Lines 1-8 of Fr. 1 are from the conclusion of a poem, of which, however, there is not enough to show clearly either the subject or metre; l. 8 may be scanned as an Adonius, but the absence of a paragraphus below l. 4 is against Sapphics. *ἡ πόλις* in l. 8 points to a political theme. The next piece opens with an apostrophe to some person who is apparently reproached as a half-hearted adherent of the party of Alcaeus. It is written in stanzas of uncertain length. If, as is possible, a paragraphus has disappeared below l. 11 (see the note there) they would be three-line stanzas, as in one of the Berlin fragments of Sappho (*Berl. Klassikertexte*, v. 2, p. 12), consisting of a second Glyconic, a greater Asclepiad, and a lesser Asclepiad. This, however, is quite doubtful, though a stanza of more than four verses is unexpected. Fr. 2, in Alcaics, is shown by the accompanying scholia to be similarly concerned with politics. The citizens are rebuked for their timidity and urged to suppress the coming tyranny, which is compared to smouldering wood that will soon be bursting into flame. In Fr. 3 hardly anything is left of the main text; a note on the lower margin explains a topographical allusion which occurred in it, and also mentions Bycchis, who figures in 1234. Fr. 3. 10 as well as in Alc. 35. 3. There is little distinctive in the other fragments with the exception of Fr. 5, where the 2,000 staters in l. 7 must mean the Lydian subvention already referred to in Fr. 1 of 1234 (reprinted above). Since Fr. 5 is evidently in Sapphics, it may even be part of the same poem as 1234. Fr. 1.

Fr. 1.

.
 [.]ν[
 ωσπάρα[
 αλλαπ[.] . [
 τῶπο . . [
 5 πολλα[.]ε[
 ωσεθέλ[
 [.]ττιτων . [
 απολισάμμᾱ[
 ουπαντ' ἤσαπ[
 10 ουδ' ασυννετ[.] σαμοισιδ[
 βώμωλατο[.] ατουτ' εφυλαξᾱ[
 μητιστωνκ[.] κοπατρίδαν ^{οπωσ[} σενφ[
 είσεταιφάνεραϊτ[.] σιναπαρχα . [

Fr. 2.

.
]
]την
]οδεπλάτυ
]κεφάλασ.μάτει
] υμεισδεσιγατεωσπερνεκρωνιεροιμυσταιο[
 5]ντεσ· δένδυναμενοιαντιστηναιτωιτυραν[
]οξύλον αλλαωμυτιληναιοιεωσεταικαπνονμονο[
]προειμονον κατασβετεκαικαταπαυσατεταχεωσμηλα[
] τεροντοφωσγενηται
]
]
]

Fr. 3.

.
]σιν[
]ακρονε . [

Fr. 1.

.
 [.]υ[
 ὡς πάρα[
 ἀλλὰ π[.] . [
 τῶ πο . . [
 5 πόλλα[.]ε[
 ὡς ἐθέλ[
 [ὄ]ττι τῶν . [
 ἀ πόλις ἄμμα [

Οὐ πάντ' ἦς ἀπ[ορος(?)
 10 οὐδ' ἀσύννετ[ο]ς ἄμ(μ)οισι δ[ὲ]
 βῶμω Λατο[ίδ]α τοῦτ' ἐφυλάξα[ο
 μή τις τῶν κ[α]κοπατρίδαν ὅπως [
 εἴσεται, φάνεραί τ[οῖ]σιν ἀπαρχαί [
 σεν φ[

Fr. 2.

.
]την
 τ]ὸ δὲ πλάτυ
] κεφάλας, μάτει
]
 5]ντες.
 ἀλλ', ὦ πολίται, νῦν, ἔτι τ]ὸ ξύλον
 ἄς ἄμμι τὸν κάπνον] προῖει μόνον
 ὑμεῖς δὲ σιγάτε ὡσπερ νεκρῶν ἱεροὶ μύσται, ο[ὐ-
 δὲν δυνάμενοι ἀντιστῆναι τῷ τυράν[ῳ].
 ἀλλ', ὦ Μυτιληναῖοι, ἕως ἔτι καπνὸν μόνον
 ἀφίησι τὸ ξύλον, τοῦτ' (ἔστιν) ἕως οὐδέπω τυραν[εύει,
 κατάσβ(η)τε καὶ καταπαύσατε ταχέως, μὴ λα[μπρό-
 τερον τὸ φῶς γένηται.

Fr. 3.

.
]σιν[
]ακρονε . [

]ελ[. . .]δι[
]ωνεισαΐδα[
 5]
] . ιλημεταξυπυρρασκα[.]μν[
]υφερωντινασπ[
]φησιτωβυκχιδι[
] . γαρμειν·

Fr. 4.		Fr. 5.	Fr. 6.
Col. i.	Col. ii.
.] . []ω[
]	. []]ναι[.]α[
]	μα[]οκλε[]ιτέργον
]α	οννο[]σέδωκ[]μα·
]π	καιτ[5]τατοσκ[5]ωντοκηων[
]	5 ανδ[]]ν
]οσ	δαιμ[σ]ντα [
]ον	αυτω[]λίοιστάτ[. . .
5]φσ	ωστο[
]	καλ . [
]	5 . κ . [
]	. . .		
.		

Fr. 7.	Fr. 8.	Fr. 9.	Fr. 10.
.
] . αθη[] . . []πε[δρ[
]]]να[αθα[
]άχη[]ν]τεφ[κα[
]γοσα[]όμα[]αδε[εδα[
5 []	5]κύθ[. . .	5 [.] . [
[]
]στο[
. . .			

Fr. 11.		Fr. 12.	Fr. 13.
Col. i.	Col. ii.
.]ασσαμι[]σ
]σσουσι	άι . []ντεσδ . []α ^ν ιεροσυ[
]υμ	μ[]φλαυροσυ[]ων
]τα[]	ου[.]ιαν
]ασ[.]
.
Fr. 14.	Fr. 15.	Fr. 16.	Fr. 17.
.
] φ . []ασα[]τιδα[]ρφ[
]ησ κ[]νοπτ[]πολυ[]ημ[
]σ δ[^τ . []ντω[] . [] . [
σνμ[.
.
Fr. 18.	Fr. 19.	Fr. 20.	Fr. 21.
.
]ξω[]βολλ[] . []πεν[
]ήκε[]αμεγ[]των[] . τ[
]αστο[]τίσδ[]αψ[]σ[
.
Fr. 22.	Fr. 23.	Fr. 24.	Fr. 25.
.
] . []ισμε[]ν[]κα[
]αλυπτ[]δ'α[]τέρ[]μο[
]νκ[.
.
Fr. 26.	Fr. 27.	Fr. 28.	Fr. 29.
.
] . []λα[]δεξα[]ιουσ . [
]λετ[] . [κτων[παντα[
.]ρισενδε[
.]ουσ . [
.

Fr. 11.	Fr. 12.	Fr. 13.	
· · · · ·	· · · · ·	· · · · ·	
]σσουσι]ασσαμι[]ς	
· · · · ·	· · · · ·	· · · · ·	
]υμ-]τα[]ντες δ . [] ἀν(τὶ τοῦ) ἱεροσυ[λ	
5]ασ[·]] φλαῦρος ἰ[]ων	
· · · · ·	· · · · ·]ίαν	
· · · · ·	· · · · ·	· · · · ·	
Fr. 14.	Fr. 15.	Fr. 16.	Fr. 17.
· · · · ·	· · · · ·	· · · · ·	· · · · ·
] φ . []ασα[]τιδα[]ρφ[
]ης]νοπτ[] πολυ[]ημ[
]ς]υτω[] · [] · [
· · · · ·	· · · · ·	· · · · ·	· · · · ·
Fr. 18.	Fr. 19.	Fr. 20.	Fr. 21.
· · · · ·	· · · · ·	· · · · ·	· · · · ·
]ξω[]βολλ[] · []πεν[
]ήκε[]αμεγ[]των[] · τ[
]αστο[]τίσδ[]αψ[]σ[
· · · · ·	· · · · ·	· · · · ·	· · · · ·
Fr. 22.	Fr. 23.	Fr. 24.	Fr. 25.
· · · · ·	· · · · ·	· · · · ·	· · · · ·
] · []ισμε[]ν[]κα[
κ]αλυπτ[]δ' ἀ[]τέρ[]μο[
]νκ[· · · · ·	· · · · ·	· · · · ·
· · · · ·	· · · · ·	· · · · ·	· · · · ·
Fr. 26.	Fr. 27.	Fr. 28.	Fr. 29.
· · · · ·	· · · · ·	· · · · ·	· · · · ·
] · []λα[]δεξα[]ιουσ . [
]λετ[] · [κ(ατὰ) τῶν [πάντα[
· · · · ·	· · · · ·	· · · · ·	ρισέν δε[
· · · · ·	· · · · ·	· · · · ·	·]ουσ . [
· · · · ·	· · · · ·	· · · · ·	· · · · ·

Fr. 1. 8. The first mark of quantity is very doubtful, being abnormally low, but this might be accounted for by supposing the accent to have been written first. *ἄμμα* may be divided *ἄμμ' ἀ*, *ἄμμ'* being either accusative or dative; for the latter cf. **1234. Fr. 1. 9** *ἄμμ' ἔδωκαν*.

9. A new poem is marked by the coronis. The letter before the lacuna is probably either γ or π ; β , however, is not impossible. An adjective to balance *ἀσύννετ[ο]ς* in the next line is wanted.

10. For the doubled ν in *ἀσύννετ[ο]ς* cf. **Fr. 4. ii. 3, 1234. Fr. 2. ii. 8** *ὀννώρινε*, and **Alc. 18. 1** where the spelling *ἀσυννέτημι* is commended by these analogies. The rest of the line is difficult. *οι* seems practically certain, and the next letter can only be σ or ϵ . Before *οι π* could well be read, but this, though the preceding *α* may perhaps be λ , gives no word. That the letter next after the lacuna is the final ς of *ασυννετ[ο]ς* is not certain, for below the curved top there is a tiny speck which is consistent with ϵ or $ο$; but to read $\tau[οσ]\epsilon$ or $\tau[οσ]ο$ does not suit the space so well, and leads to no other good result; *ἄλμοισι* cannot be regarded as likely here. We have thus been led to *αμοισι*, which would give a sense if some such verb as *συνθιγών* followed, but is unsatisfactory since the dialect requires a second μ . *γάρ* too would seem more natural than *δέ*.

11. Under the β of *βωμω* there is a narrow crack in the upper fibres of the papyrus, in which a paragraphus may possibly have disappeared, though it seems more likely that, if a paragraphus had stood here, some vestiges of it would have still been visible. There is certainly no paragraphus below either l. 12 or l. 13. The accidental omission of a paragraphus is of course not impossible, though an unsatisfactory supposition in consideration of their regularity in **1234**.

12-13. For the construction *μη . . . εἴσεται* cf. e. g. *Aristoph. Eccles. 486-8* *περισκοπουμένη . . . μη ξυμφορὰ γενήσεται*, *Aesch. Pers. 116* sqq. *φρήν ἀμύσεται φόβω . . . μη πόλις πύθηται . . . καὶ τὸ Κίσιον πόλισμ' ἀντίδουπον ἔσ(σ)εται (ἄσεται?)*, *Xen. Cyrop. iv. 1. 18* ὄρα μη πολλῶν ἐκάστῳ ἡμῶν χειρῶν δεήσει. The irregularity apparently gave rise to the marginal note. *κακοπαρίδας* is parallel in form to *εὐπατρίδης*. In **1234. Fr. 6. 12** as well as in **Alc. 37** the form *κακόπατρις* was used. For the paroxytone accent with gen. plur. of the 1st declension cf. **1231. Fr. 14. 8**, note.

Fr. 2. 3. *μάτει*: cf. *Sapph. 54. 3* *μάτεισαι*. The preceding dot is a low stop, of which there was no example in **1234**.

4. The marginal note paraphrased the text. *νεκρῶν μύσται* is an unexpected combination, and the latter part of this line is very doubtfully deciphered. *σωσ, σνε, ενε*, might well be read instead of *μν*. ϵ of *δε* has been corrected.

6-7. An approximate restoration is made possible by the marginal paraphrase. That the metre is Alcaic is sufficiently clear from the rhythms of ll. 2-3 and 6-7 in conjunction with the shorter verse in l. 4 and the final trochee in l. 5. Line 7 is followed by a blank space equivalent to three lines, and was therefore probably the last, or (allowing for one shorter line) the last but one of the column.

Fr. 4. ii. 3. *οννο*[: cf. **1234. Fr. 2. ii. 8** *ὀννώρινε* and note on **Fr. 1. 10**, above.

Fr. 6. 3-4. The accent points to *ἡλ]ιτόεργον* rather than *ι τὸ ἔργον*. Line 4, as compared with ll. 3 and 5, is too long for the last verse of a Sapphic stanza.

5. *φιλων τοκηων* occurs in **1231. Fr. 1. i. 22**.

7. There is only a short space after *α*, but the slight flourish with which it was finished is suggestive of a final letter.

Fr. 7. The metre may well be Sapphic.

Fr. 12. 1. The curved stroke below the line shows that the letters belong to a single word; cf. e. g. 1233. Fr. 2. 20. It is the opposite of the *diastole*, of which there was an example in 1234. Fr. 2. i. 6.

Fr. 15 possibly joins on above Fr. 16.

Fr. 17. 1. The doubtful ϕ may be ν .

Fr. 18. 1.] $\xi\omega$ [: or] $\zeta\omega$ [.

Fr. 21 is rather doubtfully included here.

Fr. 28. The ξ is less carefully formed than is usual in this hand, and the fragment perhaps does not belong to this text. The attribution of Fr. 29, where in l. 1 only the bottoms of the letters remain, is also uncertain.

1361. BACCHYLIDES, *Scolia*.

Fr. 1 18.1 X 13.1 cm.

First century. Plate III
(Frs. 1, 4).

Bacchylides has already figured among the *Oxyrhynchus papyri* in 1091, a column from Ode xvi (dithyramb). The fragments now published are from a different manuscript, and belong to a class not represented in the British Museum papyrus; but their authorship is at once demonstrated by a coincidence with a passage cited by Athenaeus (Bacch. Fr. 20).

The rather large and ornate handwriting has a decidedly early appearance, and is likely to fall well within the first century. Characteristic letters are ϵ and θ , of which the cross-bar commonly consists of a mere dot separated from the curved strokes. ξ is similarly treated, and ζ , in which the connecting stroke is vertical and joins the horizontal strokes at their centre, is also in the archaic style. The apices or finials frequently added to straight strokes are another noticeable feature. Hands somewhat similar in these respects may be seen in 659 and P. Rylands 20, though probably those both belong to a rather earlier period than 1361; cf. also 1238. Stops in two positions, high and medial, are employed, and accents, breathings, marks of quantity and elision, &c., have been inserted fairly frequently. Possibly some of these additions may be original, but the text has been corrected and annotated, apparently by more hands than one, and to them the diacritical signs are more probably due. It is noticeable that strophes are not marked off, as usual, by paragraphi.

Like other papyri from the same find (1906), the roll has suffered severely; only three of the forty-eight fragments recovered are of any size, these having themselves been largely built up of smaller pieces. Fr. 1, which at l. 6 sqq. coincides with Bacch. Fr. 20 and fortunately preserves the beginning of the poem from which those

attractive verses were taken, is addressed to Alexander, i. e. no doubt Alexander son of Amyntas, king of Macedon, to whom an ode was also dedicated by Pindar (Fr. 120). This Fr. 20 is commonly regarded as derived from a *Παρόλιον*, or convivial piece, although no distinct class of *Παρόλια* or *Σκόλια* is ascribed to Bacchylides by ancient authorities. That such was in fact the nature of the fragment is now quite evident from l. 5, in which the poet describes his composition as *συμποσίωσιν ἄγαλμα*. For the dedication of such poems to royal personages cf. e. g. Pindar, Fr. 125, cited from τὸ πρὸς Ἱέρωνα σκόλιον. The piece is written in dactylo-epitritic stanzas of four verses, the first four stanzas forming a prelude, after which Alexander is directly addressed.

The beginning of another poem, which is no doubt of the same class, is preserved in Fr. 4. This, as the marginal title states and would in any case be clear from internal evidence, was addressed to Hiero of Syracuse. In ll. 8-10 the poet alludes to his previous compositions in honour of the victories of Hiero's famous horse Pherenicus; and the coupling of 'chestnut steeds' with the name of Hiero in ll. 3-4 might at first sight suggest that the present piece also was designed to celebrate some success in the games. But if this were a regular epinician ode, its omission from the Hiero group in the British Museum papyrus would be very strange, and the occasion of the victory would be expected in the marginal title. Moreover, on the positive side there is not only the analogy of Fr. 1, but the direct reference in l. 6 to *σμπόται ἄνδρες*. These reasons combine to determine the classification of the poem as a convivial *σκόλιον*. Its date was subsequent to the year 476 B. C., as the mention of Aetna in l. 7 proves; and Bacchylides was not at the time in Sicily (ll. 6-7). The metre, as in Fr. 1, is dactylo-epitritic, the strophes consisting of six verses each, in the following scheme:

-- υ υ -- υ υ -- [-
 - υ - - - υ - - - [- υ - -
 - υ - - - υ υ - υ [υ -
 - - υ - -
 - υ υ - υ υ -
 - - υ - - - υ [- -

The only other piece of any size is Fr. 5, consisting of remains of two columns, those of the first being quite considerable, though there seems to be a good deal missing at the beginnings of the lines. This column contains a lengthy mythological narrative, the key to which is not yet found. Line 6 ἐν [κ]εφάλ[α . . . τ]ρίχες, with the interlinear adscript . . . ὑπὸ πατρὸς ἐν . . ., suggests a reference to the story of Pterelaus or Nisus, or some analogous myth; there is, however, no evident connexion between this and what follows, which relates to

a rape (ll. 13-14 ; cf. ll. 19-20). If]δovτ' in l. 14 (cf. l. 18) is the termination of a name (-μέδovτ' ?), this should provide the clue, but it has so far proved elusive. Notwithstanding this obscurity, the poem to which this column belonged may be presumed to be of the same class as the two discussed above. Its metre is of a different kind, and followed a more elaborate system, since no strophic correspondence is apparent.

Fr. 1. Plate III.

ωβαρβιτεμηκετιπασσαλονφυλασ[
]ν επτατονολιγυρανκαππαυεγᾱρυν.
]α δευρ'εσεμασχερασ'ορμαινωτιπεμπ[
 χρυσεονμουσαναλεξανδρωιπτερο[
 5 καισυμποσ[. . .]σιναγαλμ[. . .]εικαδεσ[
 ευτενέωνα[.]ναγκα·
 σενομεν̄ανκ[.][[ι]]σιθυμ[
 κυπριδοστελπ[.]νασ·
 ἄμειγνυμέν[.]δωροισ[
 10 ανδρασινυψο[.]μεριμν[
 αυτικ[.]μενπ[.]μνα . [
 πασ[.]χήσ[
 χρυ[.]ω[]αιρ[
 πυροφ[]απο[
 15 ν̄αεσαγο[. . .
 πλουτον̄ασ[
 ὦπ[.] . μέγαλ[
 [. . .]ουπ[
 [. . .]λάχ[
 20 [. . .]σηθυμ[
 [. . .]φρονο[
 [. . .]επερ[
 [. . .]σησο[

Fr. 2.

.
]τιγαρανθ[
]ωιχαριτ[

Fr. 1. Plate III.

ὦ Βάρβιτε, μηκέτι πάσσαλον φυλάσ[σων
 ἔπτάτονον λιγυρὰν κάππαυε γάρην·
 Ἄλεξά[ν-
 δρω]
 Ἀμύντ]α. δεῦρ' ἐς ἐμὰς χέρας· ὀρμαίνω τι πέμπ[ειν
 χρύσειον Μουσᾶν Ἀλεξάνδρω πτερὸν
 5 καὶ συμποσ[ίοι]σιν ἄγαλμ['] ἐν] εἰκάδεσ[σιν], στρ. β'
 εὔτε νέων ἀ[γαθῶν γλυκεῖ' ἀ]νάγκα
 σεομενᾶν κ[υλίκων θάλπη]σι θυμ[ὸν
 Κύπριδος τ' ἐλπ[ίς (δι)αιθύσση (?) φρέ]νας,
 ἀ μειγνυμέν[α Διονυσίοισι] δώροισ
 στρ. γ'
 10 ἀνδράσιν ὑψο[τάτω πέμπει] μερίμν[ας·
 αὐτίκ[α] μὲν π[ολίων κράδε]μνα λ[ύει,
 πᾶσ[ι δ' ἀνθρώποις μοναρ]χήσ[ειν δοκεῖ,
 χρυ[σ]ῶ [δ' ἐλέφαντί τε μαρμ]αίρ[ουσιν οἴκοι,
 πυροφ[όροι δὲ κατ' αἰγλάεντ]α πό[ντον
 15 νᾶες ἄγο]υσιν ἀπ' Αἰγύπτου μέγιστον
 πλοῦτον· ὡς [πίνοντος ὀρμαίνει κέαρ.
 ὦ π[α]ῖ μεγαλ[οσθενέος ?
 στρ. ε'
 [. . .]ουπ[
 [-υ]λάχ[-υυ-υ-υ-
 20 [-υ]ς ἢ θυμ[-υ-υ-υ-
 [-υ]φρονο[-υυ-υ-υ-
 [-υ]επερ[υυ-υ-υ-
 [-υυ]σησο[υ-υ-υ-

Fr. 2.

.
]τι γὰρ ἀνθ[
]φ χαριτ[

Fr. 3.

.
] . [.] . . [.
] φ [. . .] κοτοσσ' ο . [.
] ανθρωπωνδιαισ[.
] γοσισασδοτυχων[.

Fr. 4. Plate III.

[]]ερωνι
[]]ρακοσιωι

μηπωλιγνα . [.
 βαρβιτον·μελλ[.
 ανθεμονμουσα[. .] ρων[.
 ξανθαισινιπποισ

5 [.] εροεντελεσασ
 [.] ισυνποταισανδρεσσιπ[.
 [.] τνανεσεϋκτιτον·εικ[.
 [.] ρσθενυμνησαστοι[.
 [.] σσιλαιψ[.] ρσ[.] σφερ[.

10 [.] ωιτ[. .] καν φερε[
 [.] ρ[.] . [.] τομενος
 [.] εανε . [. . .] . [.
 [.] εμοιτοτεκουρα[.
 [.] ρσσοιδιοσπαγχρ[.

15 [.] μοστιθεσανμ[.
 [.]
 [.]
 [.] νναι[.
 [.] ναπ . [.

20 [.] . ση[.

Fr. 3.

.
] . [.] . . . [.
] φ [. . . .] κοτος· ο . [.
] ἀνθρώπων διαισ[.
] νος· ἴσας δ' ὁ τυχῶν [.

Fr. 4. Plate III.

^Ἰέρωνι
 Συρακοσίῳ.

Μήπω λιγυαχ[έ' ἀνήκω
 βάρβιτον· μέλλ[ω γὰρ ἤδη χρυσοπέπλων
 ἄνθεμον Μουσᾶ[ν Ἰέρωνι κλυτῶ
 ξανθαῖσιν ἵπποις
 5 [ίμ]ερόεν τελέσας
 [κα]ὶ συμπόταις ἀνδρεσσι π[έμπειν
 [Αἴ]τναν ἐς εὐκτιτον· εἰ καὶ
 [πρ]όσθεν ὑμνήσας τὸν [έν πάλοισ κλεεννὸν
 [πο]σσὶ λαιψ[η]ρο[ῖ]ς Φερ[ένικον ἐπ' Ἀλ-
 10 [φει]ῶ τ[ε νί]καν ^{Φερέ[νικος}
^{τ[ο]υσ . [}
 [—]ρ[υ υ —]τομενος
 [— —]εανε . [— υ — —
 [— — υ] ἐμοὶ τότε κούρα[
 [— υ —] ὄσσοι Διδς πάγχρ[υσον — —
 15 [— υ — —]μος τίθεσαν μ[υ υ —
 [— — υ — —]
 [— υ υ — υ υ —]
 [.]υναι[
 [.]ναπ . [.
 20 [.] . ση[

στρ. α'

στρ. β'

στρ. γ'

στρ. δ'

Fr. 5. Col. i.

Col. ii.

]τενειδεκαμ[
]ονίαστάλα[]	
]τερόννιντελ[]	
] . ασκαικάτάρατ[.]ι		
5]νενδονεχο[.]		
] . υποπατροσεγ[
]ιδεν[.]εφαλ[.]ριχες[[
]υσολοφουπα . . [.]	.	[
] . χαλκεομιτράν[.]	. [.]εινδ[
		. [.]λεισ . [
]οιοκορησ		. . .
10]θρασύχειρακαιμια[. . .]ν		σ[
]ησκαλυκώπιδος		× ε[
]πατέρ'έμμεν'·άλλά . [. .] . ρονος		π[
]ε[[ν]]κρατεράτεκ' ^α πτο καρτε[.]ειν		× λ . . [
]δονταναγκη·		5 × ευ . [
15]ελιου		μα . [
]ενποσειδαονίασ		ξα[
]ασελαυ		εμ[
]γτοσολβιοντεκος		π[
]εκορηνηρ	10	μο[
20]ρανηρωσ·		δο[
]του		χέ . [
]αλλικρηδεμνουθεασ		σε . [
]		. . [
]κυσαγγελος κ[.]λλισφύραν	15	δρα[
25]ανευτεμολεν·		[

Fr. 6.

. . .
]ησε[
]ούτον[
]μασσο[
]υθ . [
 . . .

Fr. 5. Col. i.

Col. ii.

]τεύει δὲ καμ[
]ονίας τάλαι[ν]
]τερὸν νιν τελ[]
] . ασ καὶ καταρατ[.]ι	
5]ν ἔνδον ἔχο[.]	
]ι δ' ἐν [κ]εφαλ[ᾱ τ]ρίχες· [] . ὑπὸ πατρὸς ἐν[
	χρ]υσολόφου πα . . [.]	[
] . χαλκεομίτραν [[.] ἐν δ[
]οιο κόρης	[.] λεις . [
10] θρασύχειρα καὶ μιαί[φονο]ν	σ[
	κόρ]ης καλυκώπιδος	ε[
] πατέρ' ἔμμεν'· ἀλλά ν[ιν] χρόνος	π[
]ε, κρατερᾶ τέκ' Πτολ(εμαῖος) καρτε[ρᾶ τεκ]εῖν.	λ . . [
]δοντ' ἀνάγκα·	5 εὐ' . . [
15	(?) ἀ]ελίου	μα . [
]εν Ποσειδαονίας	ξ[
]ις ἔλαν-	εμ[
ν]ντος ὄλβιον τέκος	π[
]ε κόρην ἤρ-	10 μο[
20	πασε]ραν ἤρωσ·	δο[
]του	χέ . [
	κ]αλλικρηδέμνου θεᾶς	σε . [
]	. . [
	ὦ]κὺς ἄγγελος κ[α]λλισφύραν	15 δρα[
25]αν εὐτ' ἔμολεν·	[

Fr. 6.

.
]ησε[
]οὔτον[
] μασσο[ν
]υθ . [

Fr. 7.	Fr. 8.	Fr. 9.	Fr. 10.
.
]]ντὰλ[]αριτω[]ιουν[
]εν·]μο[]σταιπ[]νον
]ογφυ[]·νῖ]θεοπο[]πόσιν
]μ[.]λπο[]]ητοσ[]
]οὔτοιτ[5]γιαμ[5]ατ[5]καπ[
5]σιωσφ[.
]ον·			
]εται[Fr. 11.	
]·[. . . .	
. . . .]··ν[.] . . . [
]μαινόλισγ[
		
Fr. 12.	Fr. 13.	Fr. 14.	
.	
δρ . . []μονιων[]ρεσσα[
στεφαναφο[]δειλωι . []ιν·	
x τοπενέω ^v ομοφ[]·ενεισ[]μᾶσ	
δευλύραϊτεφοι[]κωιδεθ[. . . .	
	5]ενο[
		
Fr. 15.	Fr. 16.	Fr. 17.	Fr. 18.
.
]·[]σ]ίνα[]ασ[
]σ·υπ[]εχε[]γακρο[]τοξ[
]σαισ[]·να[]κατ[]ῶστ[
]τνο[]ην]·αισ[]ιασ[
5]καιξ[]
]			
. . . .			

Fr. 7.	Fr. 8.	Fr. 9.	Fr. 10.
.
]]ν ταλ[X]αρίτω[ν(?)]ιουν[
]εν·]μο[]σται π[]νον
]ον φυ[]· νῖ-] θεοπο[μπ] πόσιν
]μ[.]λπο[]]ητοσ[]
] οὔτοι τ[5]για μ[5]ιατ[5]καπ[
5]σίως φ[.
]ον·			
]εται		Fr. 11.	
]· [.	
.]·· ν[.]· . . . [
] μαινόλις γ[
		

Fr. 12.	Fr. 13.	Fr. 14.
.
δο . . . []μονιων []οεσσα[
στεφαναφο[ρ] δειλῶ . []ιν·
τότε νέων ὁμοφ[ων]· ενεισ[]μᾶς
δ' εὐλύρα τε Φοί[βω]κῶ δὲ θ[.
	5]ενο[
	

Fr. 15.	Fr. 16.	Fr. 17.	Fr. 18.
.
]· []ς]ίνα[]ασ[
]ς· ὑπ[]εχε[]ν ἄκρο[]τοξ[
]σαισ[]· να[]ν κατ[] ὥστ[
]τνο[]ην]· αισ[]ιασ[
5] καὶ ξ[]
]			

Fr. 19.	Fr. 20.	Fr. 21.	
.	
]λε[]]θ[.]ν[
]]αταιτοσα[]. ε. [
]]ονθέμεθ[]ατοσ[
]]ποτετρω[]που[
5]]ανζαθεο[5]ον.	
]αθημενη [5]ατεδηκα[]όρ[
]μασ]μιθεοι[.	
]αιπατρι]ηκτ. [
]		
]			
]			
.			
Fr. 22.	Fr. 23.	Fr. 24.	
.	
]. []απ[]ισυνθε[
]ον[]ου[]νανθρωπ[
]θρ[]. κλ. []λε[.]πποσαωσ [
]σε[]. . οχα[]τοσ[.]νεφαλικια[
5]ρ'. [5]κκα[5]φεγγοσκατανθρωπ[
]μ[.		
.			
Fr. 25.	Fr. 26.	Fr. 27.	Fr. 28.
.
[.] . []νσυνβ[]. ερείπε[]νκαιφυσιν[
. ε[]σοτανμ[]οσεπιχθ[]εχάιτανεξ[
θυ[]άσοινω[]οτομη[]ολυχ. [
θα[]ιτιγαρ[]αιγεμ[]μφ[
5 μν[.
.			

Fr. 19.	Fr. 20.	Fr. 21.	
· · · ·	· · · ·	· · · ·	
]λει[]]θ[.]ν[
]]αται τοσα[]. ε'	
]]ον θέμεθ[]ατοσ[
]] ποτε Τρω[]που	
5]]αν ξαθεο[5]ον.	
κ]αθημένη	5]ατε δὴ κα[]όρ[
]μας	ἠ]μίθεοι	· · · ·	
]αι πατρὶ]ηκτ . [
]	· · · ·		
]			
]			
· · · ·			
Fr. 22.	Fr. 23.	Fr. 24.	
· · · ·	· · · ·]ι συνθε[
]. []απ[]ν ἀνθρωπ[
]ου[]ου[] λε[ύκι]ππος ἀὼς	
]θρ[]. κλ . [] τόσσ[ο]ν ἐφ' ἀλικία[s	
]σε[]. . οχα[5] φέγγος κατ' ἀνθρωπ[
5]ρ' . [5]κκα[
]μ[· · · ·		
· · · ·			
Fr. 25.	Fr. 26.	Fr. 27.	Fr. 28.
· · · ·	· · · · ·	· · · · ·	· · · · ·
]. []ν σὺν β[]. ερ εἶπε []ν καὶ φύσιν [
· ε[]s ὅταν μ[]ος ἐπιχθ[ον]ε χαίταν ἐξ[
θυ[]ας οἴνω[]ο τὸ μη[]ολυχ . [
θα[]ι. τί γὰρ []αι γεμ[]μφ[
5 μν[· · · · ·	· · · · ·	· · · · ·
· · · ·			

Fr. 29.	Fr. 30.	Fr. 31.	Fr. 32.
.
δ[] . νκ . []εσκο[]ται
χ[]χου[]]ν
οτ[]το[]ου]
γη[] . []]
5 μ[.]
. .			. .
Fr. 33.	Fr. 34.	Fr. 35.	Fr. 36.
.
. []τε . []οτέ . []θηκ[
αι[]νω[]σόν[]μπὰ[
ἔι[] . τ . []στ[]ωιτ[
[.
. .			
Fr. 37.	Fr. 38.	Fr. 39.	Fr. 40.
.
] . [] . δ[]ικ[]νεια[
]νουσα[]β . []κα[]ιτερ[
]τ'ὰγ[]θε[]ι[. . .
.	
Fr. 41.	Fr. 42.	Fr. 43.	Fr. 44.
.
]ισ[.] . []λο[] . οἰδ[]νοε[
]καιυπε[]ανχαρ[]νε[]ισα[
	
Fr. 45.	Fr. 46.	Fr. 47.	Fr. 48.
.
] . ε[]εν[]σ []ο[
]ιεν[] . ρ . []με[]ε[
.] . [
			. .

Fr. 29.	Fr. 30.	Fr. 31.	Fr. 32.
• •	• • •	• •	• •
δ[] . ν κ . []εσκο[]ται
χ[]χου[]]ν
ότ[]το[]ου]
γη[] . []]
5 μ[• • •	• •]
• •			• •
Fr. 33.	Fr. 34.	Fr. 35.	Fr. 36.
• •	• • •	• • •	• • •
• []τε . []οτέ . []θῆκ[
αι[]νω[]σόν[]μπα[
εί[] . τ . []στ[]φ τ[
[• • •	• • •	• • •
• •			
Fr. 37.	Fr. 38.	Fr. 39.	Fr. 40.
• • •	• • •	• • •	• • •
] . [] . δ[]ικ[]νεια[
]νουσα[]β . []κα[]ιτερ[
]τ' άγ[]θε[]ι[• • •
• • •	• •	• •	
Fr. 41.	Fr. 42.	Fr. 43.	Fr. 44.
• • •	• • •	• • •	• • •
]ισ[.] . []λο[] . οιδ[]νοε[
] καὶ ύπε[]αν χαρ[]νε[]ισα[
		• • •	• • •
Fr. 45.	Fr. 46.	Fr. 47.	Fr. 48.
• • •	• • •	• • •	• • •
] . ε[]εν[]ς]ο[
]ιευ[] . ρ . []με[]ε[
• • •	• • •	• •] . [
			• •

Fr. 1. 1-16. 'For Alexander son of Amyntas.

'My lyre, no longer hung upon the peg restrain the clear voice of thy seven strings. Hither to my hands! It is my wish to send to Alexander a golden feather from the wings of the Muses, to grace his banquets on the festal days, when, as the cups go swiftly round, a sweet force warms the heart of noble youths and a presage of the Cyprian goddess thrills the mind. Mingling with the gifts of Dionysus it sends a man's thoughts up to the clouds; straightway he is overthrowing the battlements of cities, he fancies himself monarch of the world, his halls gleam with gold and ivory, and the corn-laden ships bring vast wealth from Egypt over the radiant sea; such are the dreams wherewith the winecup stirs the soul.'

1. φυλάσ[σων: or φυλάσσουσ'; in the Anacreontea both the masc. and fem. are found, but in earlier writers the gender is not determined. βάρβιτος recurs in Fr. 4. 2, but is not elsewhere found in Bacchylides or Pindar. For πάσσαλος cf. Pindar, *Ol.* i. 18 ἀπὸ φόρμιγγα πασσάλου λάμβαν', Homer, *θ* 67 καὶ δ' ἐκ πασσαλόφι κρέμασεν φόρμιγγα.

2-3. The marginal note has been restored on the supposition that it contained the title, although in Fr. 4 this is placed rather higher up opposite the first line of the poem. The hand also seems to differ; it is more formal, like the note in Fr. 21. 5, and less distinct from the hand of the text.

4. Μουσᾶν . . . πτερῶ[ν: cf. e. g. Pindar, *Isth.* i. 64 πτερύγεσσι ἀεθέντ' ἀγλααῖς Πιερίδων.

5. εἰκάδεσ[σων: cf. e. g. Plutarch, *Non posse suaviter vivi* 4 (1089 c) ἐξ ἡμερίδων ἀναλέγεσθαι . . . ποῦ Θάσιον ἔπιον ἢ ποίας εἰκάδος ἐδείπησαν πολυτελέστατα, and the will of Epicurus in Diog. Laert. x. 18 τὴν γενομένην σύνοδον ἐκάστου μηνὸς ταῖς εἰκάσι τῶν συμφιλοσόφούντων ἡμῖν.

6. At γλυκεῖ' begins the citation in Athenaeus ii, p. 39 e (= Bacch. Fr. 20).

7. σενομενᾶν was Blass's correction of the MSS. reading σενομένα or γενομένα. The first ι of θαλπη]σι has apparently been deleted by a dot placed above it. θάλπησι also MSS. Jebb reads θάλπησι with Weir Smyth.

8. τ' ἐλπ[ις (δι)αιθύσση: ἐλπ[ις δ' αἰθύσσει (δ' ἐνθ. E) MSS., δ' ἐλπ[ις διαιθύσσει Erfurdt, δ' ἐλπ. διαιθύσση Blass. The τ' of the papyrus implies a subjunctive, but there is not room for διαιθύσση in the lacuna. Possibly αιθύσση was written (the loss of δι would be easy before αι), though this too makes a rather long supplement even when the three iotas and the ρ are allowed for.

9-10. ἃ μειγνυμέν[α . . . ἀνδράσιν: ἀναμιγνυμένα . . . ἀνδράσι δ' MSS., ἀμμιγνυμένα editors. The reading of the papyrus is probably correct.

11. αὐτίκα μὲν: Kaibel's conjecture for the MSS. reading αὐτὴ μὲν or αὐτὰς μὲν is confirmed; αὐτίχ' ὁ μὲν Bergk, ἐκτιμενᾶν Blass.

κράδε]μνα λύει: the MSS. have the unmetrical κρήδεμνον, which has been corrected by editors. Blass alters λύει to λύσειν on the ground that the lengthening of the υ would not accord with the practice of Bacchylides or Pindar, but the traditional reading is defended by Jebb.

13-14. μαρμ]αίρ[ουσι . . . αἰγλάεντ]α πό[ντον: the letters]αίρ[and]α πο[are on a detached fragment which is placed here with hesitation, since the appearance of the verso is somewhat dissimilar from the adjacent portion of Fr. 1. The combination is the more precarious because πόντον is a conjecture (Erfurdt), though a very probable one; αἰγλήεντα νῆες MSS., a spondee being lost. Bergk inserted καρπὸν after αἰγλάεντα, and this was adopted by Blass, who, however, placed it after νᾶες, mistakenly, as the papyrus now shows.

17. The accent and breathing above the supposed ω are doubtful.

18. This line should begin with a dactyl, for which the space before ουπ seems barely sufficient. Possibly there was a wrong division of ll. 17-18, or some other dislocation.

23. The tops of the letters only remain; the first, third, and fourth were round, but are not to be clearly identified.

Frs. 2-3. The strong similarity of the verso of these two fragments to that of Fr. 1 makes it probable that they belong to the same column. In Fr. 3, moreover, there is at the right-hand edge some suggestion of a selis, and if this roughly corresponded with the selis in the middle of Fr. 1, the remains of Fr. 3 would fit in with the metrical scheme, on the supposition that l. 4 (the last of the column) was the first verse of the stanza. But Fr. 3. 2 does not lend itself to combination with Fr. 1. 23.

Fr. 3. 2-3. There is much resemblance here to Bacch. Fr. 34 *ὄργαί μὲν ἀνθρώπων διακεκριμένοι μυρίαί*, but though *ορ[* is quite possible in l. 2, and the doubtful *σ* at the end of l. 3 may be *ε*, the preceding letter was apparently not *κ*. Of course if Bacch. Fr. 34 were to be identified here, Fr. 3 would belong, if not to a different column from Fr. 1, at any rate to a different poem. A small dot over the final *ν* of *ανθρωπων* is probably accidental.

Fr. 4. 1-10. 'For Hiero of Syracuse.

'Let me not yet lay aside the clear-sounding lyre; I am now about to fashion a fair flower of the gold-robed Muses for Hiero, renowned for his chestnut steeds, with those who share his banquet, and to send it to well-built Aetna. If in former time I have sung of Pherenicus, famed among steeds for his swiftness of foot, and of his victory by the Alpheus . . .'

2. Line 14 shows that this verse was a trimeter, but whether the last *μέτρον* was — ∪ — or — ∪ — is not clear.

3. For *κλυτῶ* cf. e. g. Pindar, *Pyth.* i. 37 *στεφάνοισί νιν ἵπποις τε κλυτάν*.

8-10. If [*Ἀλφει]*ϕ (Murray) is right, the reference is to Ode v, which celebrated Hiero's victory with Pherenicus at Olympia in 476 B. C. For the supplement suggested for the end of l. 8 cf. ll. 182-4 of that poem *ἔνθ' ὁ κλεινὸς ποσσὶ νικάσας δρόμῳ [ῥ]λθ[εν] Φερένικος*.

11-12. Murray suggests [*πλη]*ρ[ε] *ἔρεπ[τόμενος [Μουσῶν ἐπαλ]ε' ἀνθε'*, but *ἀνθε'* does not suit the remains in l. 12. *τομενος* may of course be *τὸ μένος*. In l. 11 a vestige of ink at one letter's distance from *ρ* may be either the top of a *φ* or *ψ*, or of some interlinear mark, e. g. a breathing.

13 sqq. It seems clear that these verses do not form an epode but follow the metre of the strophe. What remains of ll. 13-15 fits readily into the previous scheme, and the shortness of the next two lines also accords with it.

15.]μος: or possibly]μο[ι]ς.

Fr. 5. 1. *καμ[*: or *καν[*.

2. Perhaps *Ποσειδα]ονίας*; cf. l. 16.

4. The first letter, of which the lower half only remains, may be *γ*, *ι*, *ρ*, or *τ*.

7. *γ*, *ι*, *μ*, *ρ*, *τ*, *ν* would be possible after *πα*. Perhaps *πατρ[ός]* should be restored; cf. l. 6.

8. The vestige following *σ* in the second line of the marginal note may either belong to a letter, e. g. *τ*, or be a stop; cf. e. g. Fr. 21. 5.

12-13. *ἀλλά* after the stop is doubtless the conjunction, and the second accent shows that an enclitic followed; *τ[οι]* or *ν[ιν]*, e. g., would be suitable. In l. 13 the deleted *ν* points to the termination of a verb, preceded by something like *ὡς* or *ὅτε*. *κρατερῶ* is presumably to be constructed with *αναγκαι* in spite of the absence of the iota adscript. In the marginal variant the infinitive *τεκ[εῖν]* (?) was apparently made to depend on the phrase *χρόνος ἔμολε*, or

whatever the verb was. The grammarian to whom this reading is ascribed may well be Ptolemaeus of Ascalon or Ptolemaeus Pindarion, more probably the latter, if his second name may be taken to indicate an interest in the lyric poets. It may be doubted whether the son of Aristonicus flourished early enough to be quoted here.

24. κ[α]λλισφύραν is presumably a variant for some similar epithet, e.g. τανίσφυρον, which occurred in the lacuna. The word is normally of two terminations.

ii. 2. For the marginal cross here and below cf. e.g. 841 *passim*. In 1174 this symbol, which is used much like our N.B., is sometimes surmounted by a small iota.

Fr. 6. There is a close resemblance in appearance between this fragment and the upper part of Fr. 5. i; but we have not succeeded in finding a suitable combination.

Fr. 7. 3. Either μ[ε]λπο[] or -μ[ο]λπο[].

Fr. 8. This fragment, though in some ways similar to Fr. 7, is apparently not to be joined on at the bottom of it. There is a junction of two selides on the right-hand side.

Fr. 9. 3. θεοπο[μ]π: cf. Bacch. xvi. 132. The fragment is rather like Frs. 7-8, but a combination of this line with Fr. 7. 6 θεόπο[μ]π[ο]ν has little probability.

Fr. 10. 3.]πόσω: the first letter may be read as η or μ, but these are more difficult.

Fr. 11. A junction of two selides passes through the ν of μαινόλις.

Fr. 12. 4. Cf. Eurip. *Alc.* 570 ἐδύρας Ἀπόλλων. A dot in the ο of φοι gives that letter rather the appearance of θ, but the mark, if ink, is with little doubt an accident.

Fr. 13. 2. The vestige after δειλωι might be regarded as a low stop.

Fr. 14. There is a junction of two selides at the right-hand edge of this fragment; possibly, therefore, it belonged to the same column as Fr. 8. It is similarly rather worn, but of a lighter colour.

Fr. 18. 1. There is an ink-spot below the doubtful α.

3. That the mark above the partially preserved ω represents a rough breathing is uncertain.

Fr. 19. 7. An ink-spot over the α does not look like part of a circumflex or mark of quantity, and was probably accidental.

Fr. 21. A junction of selides occurs to the right of this piece, which, however, differs in appearance from Frs. 8 and 14.

Fr. 22. 5. The mark of elision is doubtfully identified.

Fr. 24. 3. ν and ι being both narrow letters, λ[ε]ύκι]ππος does not overcrowd the lacuna.

Fr. 25. 5. Whether two thick ink-marks, which occur in the margin at the point of fracture just below this line, had any meaning is uncertain.

Fr. 26. 3. οινω[] is in keeping with the class of poems represented in these fragments; cf. introd.

Fr. 27. 1. Or] . ἐρεί πε[]. But the accent is uncertain.

Fr. 29. Two selides meet just in front of this column, which must therefore be different from Fr. 5. ii, Fr. 25, and Fr. 33.

Fr. 33. 2. There is a mark of ink on the edge of the papyrus in front of this line.

Fr. 39. A reddish stain on this fragment makes it look rather similar to the top of Fr. 4, but it does not seem to belong there, although]ηκ[might be read in l. 1.

Fr. 42. 2. That this line was the last of a column seems probable, but is not certain.

Fr. 44. 1. The shape of the ο indicates which way up the fragment is to be turned.

Fr. 45. 1. A dot above the supposed ι of l. 2 may be the vestige of a long letter, φ or ψ, preceding . ε[.

Fr. 48. It is hardly certain that this fragment belongs to 1361.

1362. CALLIMACHUS, *Aetia*.

Fr. 1 24.4 × 18.5 cm.

First century. Plate IV
(Fr. 1. Col. i).

Callimachus, who for a long time was poorly represented in the papyri, has during the last few years been obtaining the position which he might reasonably be expected to occupy. The publication of the important Oxyrhynchus fragments of the *Aetia* and *Iambi* (1011) was followed by that of pieces of various poems from a papyrus book of which remains were identified both at Berlin (Wilamowitz, *Sitzungsber. Preuss. Akad., phil.-hist. Kl.*, 1912, pp. 524 sqq., 1914, pp. 222 sqq.) and Florence (P. S. I. 133), and of a scrap from the first book of the *Aetia* in P. Rylands 13 (cf. Wilamowitz, *Hermes*, xlv. 3). To these are now to be added the further fragments of the *Aetia* and *Iambi* contained in 1362 and 1363. The former consists of remains of two columns, the first of which is nearly complete, with some minor pieces which are with one exception likely to belong to the mutilated second column. They are written in a round, rather ornate uncial hand of medium size, attributable to the first century. Though no doubt of earlier date, this script has much in common with e. g. 1375 and the Bodleian Homer from Hawara; among the differentiating features are the shapes of ε, θ, μ and the 'Ptolemaic' ξ, for which cf. e. g. 1361. Stops (in two positions, high and medial), some accents, breathings, &c., have been supplied subsequently, as is clear from the different shade of the ink; they may perhaps be due to the corrector who has made slight alterations here and there in the text.

The authorship of the piece, which in any case would not have been difficult to guess, is at once established by several coincidences with extant fragments of Callimachus. Its subject is a conversation with a man named Theogenes from the island of Icus, who is questioned by the poet concerning the

association of Peleus with Icus and the ceremonies with which it was celebrated. This conversation took place at a banquet given, as we are told by Athenaeus (xi. 477 c; cf. note on l. 8), by Pollis, an Athenian. Critics have objected to the statement of Athenaeus that Pollis is not an Athenian name, and Meineke proposed to emend Ἀθηναίῳ to Θεβαίῳ, and to infer that Thebes was among the Greek cities visited by Callimachus (*ap. Schneider, Callim. ii, p. 378*). But it is now clear that the scene was Egypt, not Greece (l. 6); and the Athenian

Fr. 1. Col. i. Plate IV.

ηωσουδεπιθοιγ[[ε]]ισελανθανενουδ'οτεδουλοισ
 ημαρορεστειοιλευκοναγουσιχοεσ·
 ικαριουκαιπαιδοσαγωνεπετιον^εαγιστύν
 ατθίσινοικτίστησονφαοσηριγονη
 5 εσδαιτηγεκαλεσσενομηθέασ·ενδενυτοισι
 ξεινονοσα[.]γυπτωικαινοσανεστραφετο
 μεμβλωκωσιδιοντικαταχρεοσ·ήνδεγενεθλην
 ίκιοσ^ωξυννηειχονεγωκλισην
 ουκεπιτάξαινοσομηρικος·αιενομοιον
 10 ωσθεοσουψευδησεστονομοιοναγει·
 καιγαρόθρηκιηνμεναπέστυγεχανδονάμυστιν
 οινοποτειν·ολιγωιδήδετοκισσυβιω·
 τωιμεγεωταδελεξαπεριστέιχοντοσαλεισου
 τοτριτονευτεδαηνοννομακαιγενεην·
 15 ημαλεποστόδαληθεσοτουμονονυδατοσαισαν
 αλλετικαιλεσχησοινοσεχεινεθελει
 τηνημεισ·ουκενγ[.]ραρυστηρεσσιφορειται
 ουδέμινεισατ[. . .]·οφρνασοινοχοων
 αιτησεισορόω[.]οτελευθεροσάτμένασαινει·
 20 βαλλωμενχαλεπωιφαρμακονενποματι
 θέυγενεσ·οσ[.]·εμειοσ[.]θηνπάραθυμοσακουσαι
 [[ε]]ιχάινειταδεμοιλ[.]ξοι[.]ωι·
 μυρμιδωνέςσηνατ[.]μμισεβεσθαι
 πηλεα·κωσ[[ε]]ικωξυν[.]κα·

origin of Pollis is no less evident from ll. 1-4, the point of which is that, though living in a foreign country, he took care to observe the Athenian festivals.

The obvious aetiological drift of ll. 21 sqq. leaves no doubt that the poem is the *Aetia*, though the precise book is uncertain. Schneider supposed that Fr. 372, containing the reference to Peleus, occurred in Book i, and if that book treated of various festivals, it would be an appropriate source for a discussion of the peculiar ritual of Icus. But this attribution seems for the present quite conjectural; and the question in any case is of no great importance.

In the decipherment of this text material assistance has been rendered by Mr. E. Lobel.

Fr. 1. Col. i. Plate IV.

ἤως οὐδὲ πιθοιγῖς ἐλάνθανεν οὐδ' ὅτε δούλοις
 ἦμαρ Ὀρέστειοι λευκὸν ἄγουσι χόες,
 Ἴκαρίου καὶ παιδὸς ἄγων ἐπέτειον ἀγιστύν,
 Ἀτθίσιον οἰκτίστη, σὸν φάος, Ἡριγόνη,
 5 ἐς δαίτην ἐκάλεσσε ὀμηθέας, ἐν δέ νυ τοῖσι
 ξεῖνον ὃς Α[ί]γύπτῳ καινὸς ἀνεστρέφετο
 μεμβλωκῶς ἰδίον τι κατὰ χρέος· ἦν δὲ γενέθλην
 Ἴκιος, φῶ ξυνήν εἶχον ἐγὼ κλισίην
 οὐκ ἐπιτάξ, ἀλλ' αἶνος Ὀμηρικός, αἶεν ὅμοιον
 10 ὡς θεός, οὐ ψευδής, ἐς τὸν ὅμοιον ἄγει.
 καὶ γὰρ ὁ Θρηκίην μὲν ἀπέστυγε χανδὸν ἄμυστιν
 οἶνοποτεῖν, ὀλίγῳ δ' ἤδετο κισσυβίῳ.
 τῷ μὲν ἐγὼ τὰδ' ἔλεξα περιστείχοντος ἀλείσου
 τὸ τρίτον, εὐτ' ἐδάην οἶνομα καὶ γενεήν,
 15 Ἥ μάλ' ἔπος τόδ' ἀληθὲς ὅτ' οὐ μόνον ὕδατος αἴσαν
 ἀλλ' ἔτι καὶ λέσχης οἶνος ἔχειν ἐθέλει·
 τὴν ἡμεῖς, οὐκ ἐν γ[ὰ]ρ ἀρυστήρεσσι φορεῖται
 οὐδέ μιν εἰς ἀτ[. . .]. ὀφρύας οἶνοχόων
 αἰτήσεις ὀρώω[ν] ὅτ' ἐλεύθερος ἀτμένα σαίνει,
 20 βάλλωμεν χαλεπῷ φάρμακον ἐν πόματι,
 Θεύγενες, ὅσσ[α] δ' ἐμεῖο σ[έ]θεν πάρα θυμὸς ἀκοῦσαι
 ἰχαίνει, τάδε μοι λ[έ]ξον [ἀνειρομέν]ῳ·
 Μυρμιδόνων ἐσσηνα τί πάτριον ὕμμι σέβεσθαι
 Πηλέα, κῶς Ἴκῳ ξυ[.]κα,

25 τευδενεκενγητήτειονιδ[. .]υτ[. . .]ρτονεχουσα

Col. ii.

ηρωσκα[.]οδουπα[
 ειδοτεσωσενεπου[
 κεινηνηπερισην[
 ουθετερηνεγνωκατ[
 30 ουαταμυθεισθαιβο . [
 τ[. . .]εμεθενλεξαντο[
 τ[. . .]μακαρηπαυρωνο[
 [.]λησεινηινε[
 [.]θυνησμα[

Fr. 2.

. . . .
 . ευτ[
]ην[
]ργερ . [
]ομη[
 5] . γεσσ[
] . ιπα . [
]ρτροι[
] . [

Fr. 3.

. . . .
]
]ακακειθ[
]ν

Fr. 4.

. . . .
 . . [
 καιδι[
 πληγ[
 δειελο[
 5 καιμιναπο[
 αυλιονοθυ[

Fr. 5.

]τειχισαν[
]τερωγο[
]λωσκακ[
]κεληθ[

25 τεῦ δ' ἔνεκεν γήτειον ἰδ[. .]υτ[. . . ἄ]ρτον ἔχουσα

Col. ii.

ἦρωος κα[θ]όδου πα[ῖς
 εἰδότες ὡς ἐνέπου[σι
 κείνην ἢ περὶ σὴν [
 οὔθ' ἐτέρην ἔγνωκα· τ[
 30 οὔατα μυθεῖσθαι βο· [
 τ[αὐτ'] ἐμέθεν λέξαντο[ς
 τ[ρισ]μάκαρ, ἦ παύρων ὄ[λβιός ἐσσι μέτα,
 [ναυτι]λίης εἰ νῆιν ἔ[χεις βίον· ἀλλ' ἐμὸς αἰών
 [κύμασιν αἰ]θυίης μᾶ[λλον ἐσφκίσατο.

Fr. 2.

. . .
] . ευτ[
]ην[
]ργερ . [
]ομη[
 5] . νεσσ[
] . ιπα . [
]ρτροί[
] . [
 . . .

Fr. 4.

.
 . . [
 καὶ δι[
 πληγ[
 δείελο[
 5 καὶ μιν ἀπο[
 αὔλιον ὀθν[ει

Fr. 3.

.
]
]ακα κείθ[εν
]ν

Fr. 5.

ἐ]τείχισαν [
]τέρφ γο[
]λως κακ[
] κε ληθ[

Fr. 1. 1-26. ' . . . Nor did the morning of the opening of the wine-casks escape him, nor that when the Jar-feast of Orestes brings the lucky day for slaves; and celebrating the yearly rite of the daughter of Icarus—thy day, Erigone, who to Athenian women broughtest such woe—he bade kindred spirits to a banquet, and among them a stranger who was a recent dweller in Egypt, having come on some private business. He was by birth an Ician, and I shared his couch, not by design, but the Homeric proverb says truly that the god ever brings like to like; for he was loath to drain off Thracian bumpers of wine, but took pleasure in a modest cup. To him, as the goblet was going round for the third time, when I had learnt his name and race, I said, "It is in sooth a true saying that wine wants to be mixed not with water alone, but also with converse. This is not carried round in ladles, nor will you ask for it regarding the proud looks of the cup-bearers, when the freeman fawns upon the servant; so let us put it ourselves as a salve into the unsoftened draught, Theogenes, and tell me when I ask you all that my heart is eager to learn from you, why is it your country's custom to revere Peleus king of the Myrmidons, how does . . . Icus, and why does a girl with a leek and a . . . loaf (commemorate) the hero's coming?"'

1-2. The object of *ελάνθανεν* is Pollis; cf. Athen. xi, p. 477 c quoted in the note on l. 8. *πιθοιγίς* apparently occurs only here. The epithet *Ὀρέστειοι* alludes to the well-known legend which connected the institution of the *Χόες* with the reception of Orestes at Athens by Pandion; cf. e.g. Suidas, s.v. *Χόες*. Though this day like the other days of the Anthesteria was apparently a *dies nefastus* (cf. Photius, s.v. *μαρὰ ἡμέρα*), for slaves it was *ἡμαρ λευκόν* since it was their privilege to participate in the celebrations; cf. Schol. Hesiod, *Op.* 368 *έορτὴ Πιθοιγία, καθ' ἣν οὔτε οἰκέτην οὔτε μισθωτὸν εἶργειν τῆς ἀπολαύσεως τοῦ οἴνου θεμιτὸν ἦν, ἀλλὰ θύσαντας πᾶσι μεταδιδόναι τοῦ δῶρου τοῦ Διονύσου.*

3-4. The *έπέτειος ἀγιστός* (the substantive only here; cf. P. Rylands 13. 12 *πλαγκτύν*) in honour of Erigone, daughter of Icarus, was the *Διώρα*, at which a song called *ἀλήτης* was sung. This propitiatory festival is said (Hyg. *Astr.* ii. 4) to have been instituted as a means of averting an epidemic of suicide among the women of Athens (cf. *Ἀτθίσιν οἰκτίστη*), which followed the death of Erigone. It was an offshoot of the cult of Dionysus, but is not known to have been connected with the Anthesteria, nor need any such connexion be implied by the present passage.

8. *Ἰκιος* here and *Ἰκω* in l. 24 were recognized by Wilamowitz, whose restoration of *Ἰκῶ* for *Κῶ* in Schol. Pindar, *Pyth.* iii. 167 *ὁ Πηλεὺς ἐν Κῶ τῇ νήσῳ . . . ἀπέθανεν, ὡς Καλλιμάχος ἱστορεῖ* (*Hermes*, xlv, p. 475) receives a further confirmation; cf. Schol. Eurip. *Tr.* 1128 *καὶ προσελθεῖν* (sc. *τὸν Πηλέα*) *διὰ χειμῶνα τῇ (Ἰ)κῶ τῇ νήσῳ καὶ ξενισθέντα ὑπὸ Μόλωνός τινος Ἄβαντος ἐκεῖ καταλῦσαι τὸν βίον.* The correct reading had been preserved by the metre in the epigram of Antipater, *Anth. Pal.* vii. 2 *κεύθει καὶ θέτιδος γαμέτην ἢ βραχύβωλος Ἰκος*, where the shortening of the initial vowel, notwithstanding the scansion of Callimachus, is remarkable. There remains one more passage in which we would suggest that the name of Icus in this connexion has been corrupted, namely Athen. xi, p. 477 c, where ll. 11-14 are cited (= Callim. Fr. 109): *Καλλιμάχος . . . λέγων ἐπὶ τοῦ οἰκείου ξένου τοῦ παρὰ τῷ Ἀθηναίῳ Πόλλιδι συνεστιασθέντος αὐτῷ. Καὶ γὰρ ὁ Ὀρηκίην κτλ. οἰκείου* here seems meaningless, and Meineke, *ap. Schneider, Callim.* ii, p. 378 had already proposed *Κείου*. In view of the proximity of *ξείνον* and *Ἰκιος* in ll. 6 and 8, it can hardly be doubted that *Ἰκίου ξένου* is the true reading.

9-10. *έπιτάξ* has here the meaning assigned to it by Helladius, *Chrest.* (Phot. *Bibl.* p. 532. 36 a, Bekker) *τὸ έπιτάξ παρὰ Καλλιμάχῳ καὶ Ἀράτῳ κείμενον . . . ὁ κατ' έπιτάγμα καὶ κέλευσιν πράττεται.* Perhaps this is the sense also in 1011. 239, if *κῆπ]ιτάξ* there is rightly supplied. The *αἶνος Ὀμηρικός* is from ρ 218 *ὡς αἰεὶ τὸν ὁμοῖον ἄγει θεὸς ὡς τὸν ὁμοῖον.* Callimachus' text apparently had the usual *ὡς αἰεὶ* (*αἰεὶ τοι* Plato, *Lysis.* 214 A, Aristot. 1208 b 10), but *ές τὸν ὁμοῖον*, a variant found in many MSS.

Why the second hand rewrote the *o* of *ou* is not evident. A slight trace of ink (?) in the centre suggests that the original letter had some appearance of a *θ*; possibly *θ* or *ε* had been actually written and then amended not quite successfully.

11-14. καὶ γὰρ . . . τὸ τρίτον = Callim. Fr. 109 from Athen. xi, p. 477 c, ll. 11-12 being also found in x, p. 442 f. The reading in the second of these passages coincides with that of the papyrus, whereas in the former ἀπήνατο (l. ἀνήνατο) and ζωροποτεῖν are found in place of ἀπέστυγε and οἰνόποτεῖν, and so too in Macrob. Sat. v. 21. Schneider, following Bentley, preferred ἀπέστυγε but not οἰνόποτεῖν; the early testimony of the papyrus should now turn the scale in favour of the latter reading.

15-16. These two verses are quoted anonymously by Athen. i, p. 32 b along with one of Simonides, and the three lines appear together as Simonides Fr. 88 in Bergk's *Poet. Lyr.* The MSS. of Athenaeus have γὰρ for μάλ', ἀλλά τι for ἀλλ' ἔτι, and, except L, λεύχης for λέσχης. Kaibel adopted Porson's conjecture ἦν ἄρ' for ἦ γάρ and Bergk's χλεύης for λεύχης, neither of which is confirmed. λέσχης was rightly restored by H. Stephanus (*Anthol.* p. 513) and read by Casaubon and Schweighäuser.

18-19. The restoration and sense of these two verses remains in doubt. In l. 18 δφρύας seems inevitable, and the accented *ε* commends οὐδέ μιν, which, though the doubtful *ι* might be *ε*, is more likely than οὐδ' ἔμεν. The following vowel may be either *ε* or *ο*; if *εἰς* is right, ατ . . . should be an epithet of either δφρύας or οἰνοχόων, preferably the former, since the exiguous traces of the letter after the lacuna suit *s* better than *ν*. ἀπενεῖς, ἀπρεμῖς, ἀτρόμους, ἀτρόπους might serve. ἀτμένα σαίνει is more in accord with the tenor of the passage than ἀτμένας αἰνεῖ, and the clause ὅτ' . . . σαίνει is apparently a general description of the attitude of the guest on such occasions. It is hardly likely that an allusion is to be recognized to the license permitted to slaves at the Anthesteria (cf. note on ll. 1-2), with which, so far as is known, the Αἰώρα, as remarked above, had nothing to do. The double accentuation of ἀτμένα may have arisen from confusion with ἀτμενος.

22. ιχαινει apparently = ιχανῶ, a form found in Babrius 77. 2, Herondas 7. 25, Hesych., &c. ιχάινειν is not otherwise attested, but is credible enough. For ἀνειρομένω cf. the Berlin fragment in *Sitzungsber. Berl. Akad.* 1914, p. 224 ὅσσα δ' ἀνειρομένω φῆ[σ]ε, τὰ δ' ἐξέρω.

23. Μυρμιδόνων ἐσσῆνα = Callim. Fr. 508. The rough breathing apparently given to ἐσσῆνα in the papyrus may reflect a supposed connexion with ἐσμός; cf. *Etym. Magn.* 383. 30 ἐσσῆν . . . ἀπὸ μεταφορᾶς τοῦ μελισσῶν βασιλέως: derivations from ἔσσαι and ἦσσαν are also there suggested.

24. Πηλέα . . . Ἰκω; cf. Callim. Fr. 372 and note on l. 8 above. At the end of the verse]κα may be either an acc. sing. of some noun in -ξ or a neut. plur. ξυν[ὰ τὰ Θεσσαλι]κά, which Lobel suggests, would give a suitable sense. For κῶς cf. 1011. 4, 18 κοτέ.

25-6. A leek and a loaf were apparently the accompaniments of some ritual act performed by a girl. For the former cf. e.g. the use of πράσα at the archaic feast of the Dioscuri at Athens (Athen. iv, p. 137 e) and of γηθυλλίδες at the Theoxenia at Delphi (id. ix, p. 372 a). [. . .]ντ[. . .] is presumably an epithet of ἄ]ρτον; there must have been at least two letters between ιδ and ν, so that ε]ντ . . . is excluded unless the *ε* of ιδέ was unelided, which is not at all likely. πα[in l. 26 suggests πα[ίς or πα[ρθένος.

30. βo is followed by remains of a perpendicular stroke.

32-4 = Callim. Fr. 111. 2-4, which are now proved to have no connexion with the verse ἐνθ' ἀνέμων μεγάλων κῦμα διαλύγιον associated with them by editors against the indications in Stobaeus. Schneider's conjectural reconstruction of the context, as might be expected, also turns out to be wrong. On the other hand the first words of l. 33, which are given in the MSS. as ναυτιλίησιν ἦν, had been successfully emended, Bentley's νῆιν and Nauck's εἰ (ὅς Bentley) being now confirmed.

Frs. 2-4. These may be assigned with probability to the second column of Fr. 1, Fr. 4 being from the bottom of it. Fr. 5, which is of a lighter colour than the rest, is from the top of a different column.

Fr. 4. 4. δέειλο[: this line possibly = Callim. Fr. 190 δέειλον αἰτίζουσιν, ἄγουσι δὲ χεῖρας ἀπ' ἔργου.

5. ἀπο[: ΟΓ ἀπε[.

6. ἀλλιον is probably the substantive, as the paroxytone accent will then be intelligible, though abnormal.

1363. CALLIMACHUS, *Iambi*.

10.3 × 2.6 cm.

Second or early third century. Plate VI.

The identification of this fragment is assured by the occurrence in ll. 5-7 of Callimachus Fr. 86, where an acute emendation of Bentley receives confirmation. Unfortunately both beginnings and ends of lines are missing throughout, and the loss is too serious for a satisfactory restoration. It seems fairly clear, however, that Schneider's suggestion that the persons addressed in Fr. 86 were ἄθροισι in general (*Callim.* i, p. 252) was wide of the mark, for the context here deals with poetry and literary matters. The poet is apparently apostrophizing various classes of writers. There is a close similarity between this piece and Fol. 6 of 1011, and they may well be parts of the same poem.

This text is on the verso of a narrow strip which on the recto has the beginnings of a dozen lines of, apparently, some official list drawn up towards the end of the second century. The writing on the verso is a small informal uncial which does not seem to be appreciably later in date; it may fall within the second century or belong to the beginning of the third. Stops, which are in the high position, accents, and breathings are with little doubt due to a second hand, and the mark of elision in l. 3 should perhaps be classed with these; the diaeresis in l. 5, on the contrary, is most probably original.

.
 [. . . .] . . β[
 [. . . . α] νδρες οι νυν [
 [. . . . κα] τήυλησθ' οι με[
 [. . . .] τε Μουσεων κα[ι
 5 [ες το προ] τέχευς ἴρον [ἄλεες δευτε
 [ου τον] πάλαι Πάγχαιον ο πλασας Ζανα
 [γερων] λαλάζων ἀδι[κα βιβλια ψηχει (?)

- [.]ι γαρ εντος ου[
 [.]άγη τις· η πολ[
 10 [.]ντα βωμοί τ[
 [.]αι προς Αιδην [
 [.]ανδρες ὀκόσοι βο[
 [.]τραγῳδοι μουσα τ[
 [.]φ]θονος τις εμ[
 15 [.] δε και τὸν ὄς χ[
 [.]ν εταιρην ατ[
 [.]ἴ]αμβον οστι[s
 [.] . ὡς τις τους ν[
 [.]άμετρα τοις [
 20 [.]ν οστις τηι [
 [.]π]ολλους· εν[
 [.]α]νδρες· ὡς [
 [.] εκ γῆς ηλπ[ισ
 [.]μέουσιν[
 25 [.]ηστην πν[
 [.]ως μητο[
 [.] και γρ[
 [.]ε]ξαρκ[
 [.] . μαι[
 30 [.]δ[?] . [

5-7 = Callim. Fr. 86. In l. 5 *ιερόν* is the MSS. reading, which had been corrected by Meineke. The rough breathing on *αλεες* is doubtfully identified; a smooth one would be equally possible. In l. 6 *Παγχαῖον* (so normally accented) was Bentley's correction of the traditional *χάλκεον*. The remains of the first letter of l. 7 are inconsistent with *ν*, and *λαλαζων* was apparently written, though the grave accent on the *a* implies *ἀλαζών*, the ordinary reading, which there is no reason to doubt. Since a new sentence begins at l. 8, a finite verb seems to be required after *βιβλία*, and *ψήχων* which Schneider adopts from Sextus Empiricus is unlikely to be right. Other sources give *ψύχει* or *ψύχε*, of which the former was defended by Reiske; *ψήχει* Bentley, *ψήχε* Dübner, *ξύει* Toup.

10.]ντα: or]αιτα,]λιτα, &c.

11.]αι: or ν.

13. It is rather tempting to identify this line with Callim. Fr. 98 c, which is given in Schol. Saibant. on Hephaest. p. 36, Gaisf. ii in the form *ἦτις τραγωδὸς μουσα ληκυθίζουσα*. Unfortunately the letter after *μουσα* is uncertain. A vestige of the top of it suggests a τ,

and λ, though perhaps not impossible, is unsatisfactory, since some of the lower part should be visible. It would therefore be rash, in spite of the similarity to Fr. 98 c, to assume that the first part of the line as given by Schol. Saibant. is corrupt.

19. [τὰ πεντ]άμετρα is likely on the analogy of 1011. 313, 366.

25.]ει,]αι, or]λι are also possible before σ.

29. The supposed mark of length may be a rough breathing.

1364. ANTIPHON SOPHISTES, Περὶ Ἀληθείας i.

Fr. 1 22.3 × 38 cm. Early third century. Plate V
(Fr. 1. Cols. v-vii).

The following fragments are written in a good-sized, sloping hand strongly resembling that of 7 (Sappho; Part I, Plate ii), and dating probably from the opening decades of the third century. As in 463, an analogous though perhaps rather earlier specimen of the same type, the columns are narrow and somewhat short, the written surface measuring approximately 17 by $4\frac{1}{2}$ -5 cm.; in 463 they were about 16 × 5 cm. It is noticeable that the ξ is formed by three distinct strokes, the comma-shaped middle stroke as a rule not touching either of the two horizontal ones. At the ends of lines the size of the letters was sometimes considerably diminished, but the scribe was nevertheless not very successful in maintaining a uniform length; the common angular sign is used as a supplement here and there. Some alterations have been introduced into the text by a corrector to whom are likely to be due the occasional accents, breathings, and marks of elision and quantity (e. g. l. 113). Perhaps he was also responsible for the punctuation, for which high and medial dots were usually employed; of the low dot only one instance occurs (l. 289). In any case, however, these additions may be regarded as practically contemporary.

The authorship of the fragment is fortunately established by the coincidence, pointed out to us by Wilamowitz, of ll. 18-20 with a citation in Harpocration from the treatise of Antiphon 'On Truth' (Diels, *Vorsokratiker*, ii, p. 298, Fr. 44). This is the sophist Antiphon, to be distinguished from his more famous contemporary, the orator Antiphon of Rhamnus. There was much confusion between the two, and their identity and the attribution of their writings early gave rise to discussion; cf. Hermog., *De ideis*, ii. 11. 7. Concerning the sophist few facts are known (see H. Sauppe in *Ausgew. Schriften*, 508 sqq., Blass, *Att. Bereds.* i. 108 sqq., Zeller, *Gr. Phil.* i. 1070, Gomperz, *Gr. Denker*, i, pp. 434 sqq., Engl. ed.). Suidas describes him as Ἀθηναῖος τερατοσκόπος καὶ ἐποιοῦς καὶ σοφιστής· ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ Λογομάγειρος, and attributes to him a work Περὶ κρίσεως ὀνείρων. Arguments between him and Socrates are reported by Xenophon, *Mem.* i. 6, and Ἀντιφῶν ὁ τερατοσκόπος is mentioned as one of Socrates' opponents

by Aristotle (*ap.* Diog. Laert. ii. 46). Besides the treatises 'On Truth' and 'On the Interpretation of Dreams', Antiphon is commonly credited with a work *Περὶ ὁμοιοίας*, which is praised by Philostratus (*Vit. Sophist.* i. 15) and quoted at some length by Stobaeus, and more doubtfully with another called *Πολιτικός*, of which a few words and phrases are preserved. The *Περὶ ἀληθείας* was in two books, and the surviving remains go to show that the first of them dealt with metaphysics, the second with physics. Blass, however (*De Antiphonte Sophista Iamblichii auctore*, p. 12), had already argued from certain fragments cited from Book i (e. g. 2, 14, 17) that, besides metaphysical problems, questions of human conduct were discussed in it. This judgement finds its justification in the present papyrus, which proves that the ethical and political speculations of Antiphon were not limited to the *Περὶ ὁμοιοίας* and the *Πολιτικός*, but had some expression also in the *Περὶ ἀληθείας*. That 1364 is from the first book of that treatise is not certain, though eminently probable in view of the analogous fragments to which attention was called by Blass; it may be noted too that *φύσις* and *νόμος*, so prominent in 1364, are opposed in a fragment from Book i (*Ant. Fr.* 15), though the contrast there is of a different kind. Since the 400th *στίχος* is marked in l. 188, the section here recovered occurred in the earlier part of the book.

The papyrus consists of two main fragments with some small pieces, the place of which we have not been able to find. In *Fr.* 1, which contains six consecutive columns nearly complete and the beginnings of lines of a seventh, the subject throughout is the antithesis between law and nature. After defining justice as the observance of law, the writer proceeds to maintain that it is advantageous to disregard the law and follow nature when this can be done without detection. The laws of man may be broken with impunity, but not the laws of nature, and they are often in antagonism. Laws are a restraint on nature, and in so far are irksome and painful, i. e. harmful. Obedience to specific laws may also involve a positive loss of pleasure or increase of pain. Nor do the laws sufficiently counterbalance these defects by the advantages attaching to obedience. The position of *Fr.* 2 relatively to *Fr.* 1 is unknown, but at least one column intervened between them if *Fr.* 2 followed *Fr.* 1, and apparently a gap must also be postulated if the order is reversed. This fragment contains the ends of some lines of one column and the greater part of a second. The subject is still *φύσις*, but in a rather different aspect. Antiphon is here maintaining the unnaturalness of distinctions of class and race. Men are all alike in their physical functions and requirements; the barbarian is not differentiated by nature from the Hellene.

This opposition between *φύσις* and *νόμος*, fundamental in the later sophistic

ethics, was, of course, not new. The antithesis is said to have been formulated by Archelaus, the pupil of Anaxagoras and teacher of Socrates (Diog. Laert. ii. 4 ἔλεγε . . . καὶ τὸ δίκαιον καὶ τὸ αἰσχρὸν οὐ φύσει ἀλλὰ νόμῳ). Hippias in Xen. *Mem.* iv. 4. 14 emphasizes the diversity of laws in different localities, and Plato puts into his mouth language analogous to that of Antiphon in ll. 59–63 below (*Prot.* 337 c ὁ δὲ νόμος, τύραννος ὢν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, πολλὰ παρὰ τὴν φύσιν βιάζεται). Similarly Protagoras in the *Theaetetus* (167 c) is made to remark on the conventionality and instability of right. Plato's views as to the ill effects of the doctrine may be read in *Laws* 889 d–e. But no such elaborate exposition of it as that here recovered has survived from the age of the older sophists. Remarkable too are the practical applications which Antiphon was apparently prepared to make of his theory. Gomperz has observed in connexion with this very philosopher that 'it was a sheer impossibility for the sophists . . . to promulgate anti-social doctrines' (*Gr. Denker*, i, p. 436, Engl. ed.). Teaching which explicitly justified furtive breaches of the law (ll. 12–23, 36–43), and treated obedience as merely a question of personal expediency (ll. 56 sqq.), cannot, to say the least, be regarded as pro-social. In his insistence on the artificiality of distinctions of birth Antiphon appears in a more favourable light. Here too the papyrus is likely to provide a *locus classicus*. Similar ideas are expressed e. g. by Euripides (Fr. 168 ὀνόματι μέμπτον τὸ νόθον, ἢ φύσις δ' ἴση, Fr. 336 ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἐσθλὸς εὐγενής, *Ion* 854–6), but it would not be easy to find a more striking anticipation of the cosmopolitan ideal of the Cynics than that contained in Fr. 2. The judgement of E. Jacoby, *De Ant. Soph.* Περὶ ὁμοιοίας, 1908, p. 29, that Antiphon *a Cynicorum grege rerum naturae veritatem imitantium vehementer abhorreat* turns out to be singularly wide of the mark.

By its revelation of the views professed by Antiphon on the subject of nature and law 1364 gives the *coup de grâce* to Blass's theory (*De Antiphonte Sophista Iamblichi auctore*) that certain passages in the *Protrepticus* of Iamblichus, which he acutely recognized as taken from an old Attic writer, were derived from our sophist. This attribution was contested on stylistic grounds by K. Töpfer (*xxi. Jahresb. d. Gymn. in Ainau*, 1902) and E. Jacoby (*op. cit.*), and rejected by Wilamowitz (*Aristot. u. Athen*, i. 174), but accepted without reserve by Gomperz (*op. cit.* i, pp. 435 sqq., 585). Unfortunately one of the arguments used by Blass was the absence in the remains of Antiphon of this very doctrine about law and nature of which he is now seen to have been so thorough-going an exponent. The author of the passages in the *Protrepticus* held very different opinions. It is clear that such sentences as οὐκ ἐπὶ πλεονεξίαν ὀρμῶν δεῖ οὐδὲ τὸ κράτος . . . ἡγεῖσθαι ἀρετὴν εἶναι, τὸ δὲ τῶν νόμων ὑπακούειν δειλίαν . . . φύσει γὰρ ἰσχυρᾷ ἐνδεδέσθαι ταῦτα (sc. τὸν τε νόμον καὶ τὸ δίκαιον) and ἡ μὲν εὐνομία

ἄριστον εἶη καὶ κοινῇ καὶ ἰδίᾳ, ἢ ἀνομία δὲ κάκιστον (Blass, Frs. E, F = Iambl. pp. 100, 101 Pist.) can no longer be attributed to the sophist Antiphon.

The estimate of the literary qualities of the *Περὶ ἀληθείας* found in Hermogenes, *De ideis*, ii. 11. 17 is on the whole borne out by the new fragments; cf. the careful analysis of Antiphon's style by Jacoby, *op. cit.* pp. 48 sqq., based largely on the remnants of the *Περὶ ὁμοιοίας*. After remarking that Thucydides was πολλῶ κεχωρισμένον (from Antiphon the orator) καὶ κεκοιμηκότα τῷ εἶδει τῶν τῆς Ἀληθείας λόγων Hermogenes continues (c. 9) ὁ δ' ἕτερος Ἀντιφῶν, οὐπερ οἱ τῆς Ἀληθείας εἰσὶ λεγόμενοι λόγοι, πολιτικὸς μὲν ἥκιστα ἔστι, σεμνὸς δὲ καὶ ὑπέρογκος τοῖς τε ἄλλοις καὶ τῷ δι' ἀποφάνσεων περαίνειν τὸ πᾶν, ὃ δὴ τοῦ ἀξιωματικοῦ τε λόγου ἔστι καὶ πρὸς μέγεθος ὀρώντος, ὑψηλὸς δὲ τῇ λέξει καὶ τραχύς, ὥστε μὴ πόρρω σκληρότητος εἶναι. καὶ περιβάλλει δὲ χωρὶς εὐκρινείας, διὸ καὶ συγγεῖ τὸν λόγον καὶ ἔστιν ἀσαφῆς τὰ πολλά. καὶ ἐπιμελῆς δὲ κατὰ τὴν συνθήκην καὶ ταῖς παρισώσεσι χαίρων, οὐ μὴν ἥθους γέ τι οὐδ' ἀληθινῶ τύπου μέτεστι τῷ ἀνδρί, φαίην δ' ἂν ὡς οὐδὲ δεινότητος πλὴν τῆς φαινομένης μὲν, οὐ μὴν οὔσης γε ὡς ἀληθῶς. One obvious detail in common with Thucydides is the spelling ξυν, which is consistently written in the papyrus. On the other hand ττ is found in ll. 151, 164; the previously extant fragments show σσ three times (Fr. 54 ἔλασσον, Fr. 61 ἐκπλήσσοινο, Fr. 76 ἠσσώμενον), ττ in other places. An instance of an Ionicism occurs in l. 116 ἦδοντα. The writer's tendency to poetical language may be seen in the metaphorical use of δεσμός in l. 104, and his tendency to poetical rhythm in the iambic trimeter in ll. 20-3; cf. note *ad loc.* A fondness for synonyms remarked in the extant fragments is further exemplified by ll. 266-7, 270-1. Parallelism and antithesis are prominent, and Hermogenes was clearly right in saying that Antiphon was ἐπιμελῆς κατὰ τὴν συνθήκην καὶ ταῖς παρισώσεσι χαίρων. The characteristic τὸ δι' ἀποφάνσεων περαίνειν is also much in evidence. Emphasis is sometimes gained by adding negative to affirmative clauses, as in ll. 161-2; and the not infrequent omission of the verb εἶναι helps to give a sententious effect. Hermogenes' imputations of obscurity and superficiality were probably not altogether ill-founded. The argument in ll. 84 sqq. seems rather lacking in lucidity. Still, for the most part the writer puts his points clearly and forcibly enough, and the ornate style is effective and not unpleasing. These fragments are a notable addition to the relics of early Attic prose, and are of real interest for the history of Greek literature as well as for that of Greek philosophy.

Fr. 1.

Col. i.

[.....]θου

[.....]η>

Col. ii.

θ[ε]ντα [[ο]υχ [ο]]>>

35 [[μολογηθεν]]>>

- [.]με
 [.]νευ
 5 [.]μι >
 [. . .] δικα[ιοσ]υνη
 [πα]ντα της πο
 [λεω]ς νομιμα·
 [εν] ηι αν πολι
 10 [τευ]ηται τις μη
 [παρ]αβαινειν·
 χρωτ' αν ουν
 ανθρωπος μα
 λιστα [[θ]] εαυτωι
 15 ξυμφ[ε]ροντως
 δικαιοσυνη· ει
 μετα μεν μαρ
 τυρων τ[ο]υς νο
 μους μεγα[λο]υς
 20 αγοι· μονουμε
 νος δε μαρτυ
 ρων τα της φυ
 σεως· τα μεν γαρ
 των νομων
 25 [επιθ]ετα· τα δε
 [της] φυσεως α >
 [ναγ]καια· και τα
 [μεν] των νο >
 [μω]ν ομολογη
 30 [θεντ]α ου φυν
 [τ εστι]ν· τα δε >
 [της φυσ]εως φυν [
 [τα ουχ] ομολογη [
 [[τα]] τα ουν νομι
 [[—]]
 μα παραβαινων
 η αν αθηι τους
 ομολογησαντας
 40 και αισχυνης
 και ζημιας α >
 πηλλακται· μη
 λαθων δ' ου· των·
 δε τη φυσει ξυμ
 45 φυτων εαν τε
 παρα το δυνατον
 βιαζεται· εαν
 τε παντας αν
 θρωπους λ[[η]]θηι·
 50 ουδεν ελαττον
 το κακου[.] εαν τε
 παντες ιδωσιν
 ουδεν μειζον·
 ου γαρ δια δόξαν
 βλατεται· αλλα
 55 δι^παληθειαν· εστι
^{παν}δε των[[δε]] ενε >
 κα τουτων η σκε
 ψις· οτι τα πολλα
 60 των κατα νο
 μον δικαιων
 πολεμιως τη
 φυσ[ει] κειται· νε
 νο[μο]θ[ε]τηται
 65 γαρ [ε]πι τε τοις ο
 φ[θ]αλμ[[ι]]οις α δει

Col. iii.

αυτο[υ]ς οραν· και >
 ἃ ου [δε]ι· [[σ]] και επι
 τοις ὤσιν α δει αυ
 70 τα ακουειν· και
 ἃ ου δει· και επι τη
 γλωττη α τ[ε] >
 δει αυτην λεγειν
 και α ου δει· και ε
 75 πι ταις χερσιν
 α τε δει αυτας δραν
 και α ου δει· και
 επι τοις ποσιν ε
 φ α τε δει αυτους
 80 ιεναι και εφ α ου
 δει· και επι τωι νῶι
 ων τε δι αυτον
 επιθυμειν και
 ω μη [εστι]ν ουν
 85 ουδε τ[η]ι φυσει
 φιλιωτ[ερ]α ουδ οι
 κειοτε[ρα] αφ ων
 οι νομο[ι] α]ποτρε
 πουσι τ[ους] αυ[θ]ρωπ[ους]
 90 η εφ α [προτρε
 πουσ[ιν] τ[ο] γαρ
 ζην [ε]στι της φυ
 σεως κ[αι] τ[ο] απο
 θαν[ει]ν και το [
 95 μεν [ξ]ην αυτ[ο]ις
 εστι[ν] α]πο των [

Col. iv.

100 φεροντων· τα
 δε ξυμφεροντα·
 τα μεν απο των
 νομων κε[ι] >
 μενα δεσμ[α]
 105 της φυσεως ε[στι]
 τα δ υπο της φυ
 σεως ελευθερα· ου [
 κουν τα αλγυ >
 νουντα ορθωι λ[ο]
 110 γωι ονίγησι τη[ν]
 φυσιν μαλλον
 η τα ευφραινον
 τα· ουκουν αν ου
 δε ξυμφερον
 115 τ' ειη τα λυπου[ντα]
 μαλλον η τ[α] η
 δοντ[α] τα γαρ τωι [
 αληθει ξυμφε
 ρ[ο]ντα ου βλα [
 120 π[τ]ειν δει· αλλ ω
 φ[ε]λειν· τα τοινυν
 τηι φυσει ξυμ [
 φεροντα τ[ο]υτ[ε].
 2 lines lost.
 126 [.]οτια[. . .]
 [.]απ[. . .]
 [.] ανα[. . .]
 [.] και οι . [
 130 [.]νται· και[ι]

ξυμ[φερο]ντω[ν
 το δε α[ποθανειν
 απο τ[ων μη ξυμ

[οιτινε]ς αν πα [

Col. v. Plate V.

[θον]τες αμυνων
 [ται κ]αι μη αυτοι
 [αρχ]ωσι του δραν·
 135 [και ο]ιτινε[ς] αν
 [τους] γειναμε
 [νου]ς και κακους
 ογτας εις αυτους
 ευ ποιωσι· και οι
 140 κατομνυσθαι
 διδοντες ετε >
 ροις· αυτοι δε μη
 κατομνυμε
 [νοι] και τουτων
 145 των ειρημενων
 πολλ αν τις ευ
 ροι πολεμια τη
 φυσει· ^ν ενι τε αυ
 τοις [[δ]] αγυνεσθαι
 150 τε μαλλον εξον
 ηττω· [[ι]] και ελατ
 τω· ηδεσθαι· εξον
 πλειω και καως
 πασχειν· εξον
 155 μη πασχειν·
 ει μεν ουν τις
 [τ]οις τοιαυτα προ
 [ι]εμενοις επικου
 [ρ]ησις εγιγνε

Col. vi. Plate V.

165 ουκ αν[ωφελε]ς αν
 [[ν]]ην τ[οις νο
 μοις πει]θεσθαι νυν
 δε φαινε[ται τοις
 προσ]ιεμ[ενοις
 170 τα τοιαυτα το ε[κ
 νομου δικαι]ον
 ουχ' ικανον επι
 κουρειν· ο γε πρω
 τον μεν επιτρε
 175 πει τωι πασχον
 τι παθειν και τωι
 δρωντι δρασαι·
 και ουτε ενταυ
 θα διεκωλυε τον
 180 πασχοντα μη
 παθειν· ουδε τον
 δρωντα δρασαι·
 εις τε την τιμω
 ριαν αναφερο >
 185 μενον ουδεν
 ιδιωτερον επι
 [τ]ωι [π]επονθοτι
 δ̄ η τωι δεδρακο
 [τι] περαι γαρ α[.
 190 α[.]το . [.]υστ . [.
 ρ[. . . .]αδ ως ε
 παθεν [.] δυνα
 σθαι απ[. . .]ει δι

160 [το] παρα των νο
[μ]ων. τοις δε μη
[π]ροϊεμενοις αλ
[λ ε]ν[[.]]αντιουμε
[ν]οις ελαττωσις.

κην [. . .]ν. τὰν
195 τὰ δε κ[α]ταλει
πετα[ι] και τωι δρα
σαντ[ι α]ρνεισθαι

Col. vii. Plate V.

4 lines lost.
202 [. . .] . . . [ε
στυν μαλ[
οσηπερ τ[ωι . . . κα
205 τηγορου[ντι η της
κατηγορ[ιας . . .
πειθω α . [.
τωι τε πε[πονθο
τι και τω[ι δεδρα
210 κοτι γιγ[νεται
γαρ ν[
μασι κ[
και κ[
δυν[α
215 δεσα[
ουδ[

μα[.] εν
τευθ[εν
ως ε . [
220 τωι [
εδ[
α[
τ[
θ[
225 [[α[
[[ν[
[[ασ[
η[
ν[
230 τω[
[[ν]]

Fr. 2.

Col. i.
]του
].
]ο
235]λ
ανθ]ρωποις
]ματα >
]η της
]ηλου· ε
240]ωσενε

Col. ii.
ρων επ[αιδουμε
θα τε κ[αι σεβομεθα
τους δε [εκ φαν
λοῦ οικ[ου οντας
270 ουτε επ[αιδουμε
θα. ουτε σεβομ[εθα
εν τ[ο]ντω[ι γαρ
προς αλλη[λους
βεβαρβαρω[με

	τέ]κμαιρε	275	θα· επει φυσει [>
] παρεχει		παντα παντ[εσ
]· [.]τας		ομοιωσ πεφυκ[α
]ειστων		μεν και βαρβα [
245]ρων]]		ροι και Ελλην[εσ
]τα ε	280	ειναι· σκοπειν [
]αν >		δ[ε] παρεχει τα >
]κ[· ·]		των φυσει [οντων
]		αναγκαι[ων
]		πασιν αν[θρω
]	285	ποισ· π[·
]		τα[
			τε κατ[α
			δυνα[·
			και εκ[·
			τοις· ουτε β[αρβα
		290	ροσ αφωρι[σται
]		[[δ]] ημων ο[υδεις
]		ουτε Ελλην[·] α [
]		ναπνεομεν
]		τε γαρ εις τον α
]	295	ερ[α] απαντες >
262]νο		κατα το στομ[α]
]ν		[κ]αι κατ[α] τας ρι
]υσ]]		νας· κ[αι]
265	ου ο[· ·]		[· ·]ν χ[
]εν[· ·]		·
	·		·

Fr. 3.

·
]· · [·
]νιεις· αλ[·
]χοι[·]ανο[·
]· [· . . .]σαλ[·

Fr. 4.

·
]ο· [·
]· · [·
]ν[·
]πο[·

Fr. 5.

·
]νο[·
]η[·
]· · ν[·
]νομ[·

5	λο]γου· ν[]ενε[]αυτ[· . . .	5]ν· · []ακα] προς] · . . .	5]νoσ[· . . .
---	---	---	--------------------

Fr. 6.

Fr. 7.

Fr. 8.

Fr. 9.

· . . .
]απ[· . . .
]αιτ[· . . .
]· αλ[· . . .
]ισ[

]ουσα[

]· μ[

]τοτ[

]ν[

]· οτ[

]· [

]ιθ[

]· ον[

]το· [

· . . .

· . . .

· . . .

Fr. 10.

Fr. 11.

Fr. 12.

Fr. 13.

· . . .
]· [· . . .
]α· [· . . .
]ητ[· . . .
]ν[

]μη[

]οια[

]π[

]ουσ[

· . . .

· . . .

· . . .

6-189. ' . . . justice consists in not transgressing any of the ordinances of the state of which one is a citizen. A man would therefore exercise justice with most advantage to himself if in the presence of witnesses he held in esteem the laws, but in the absence of witnesses, the precepts of nature. For the precepts of the laws are adventitious, whereas those of nature are necessary, and the precepts of the laws are the product of agreement, not of growth, while those of nature are the product of growth, not of agreement. Thus in transgressing legal ordinances, whenever he is unobserved by the parties to the agreement, he is free both from shame and punishment, but not if he is observed. On the other hand, if he strain any of the innate principles of nature more than it can bear, the evil is no less, if he is unobserved by every one, nor any greater, if every one sees. For the injury does not depend on opinion but on fact. All this is the object of our inquiry; because most of what is just according to law stands in opposition to nature. The law has laid down for the eyes what they ought to see and what they ought not, for the ears what they ought to hear and what they ought not, for the tongue what it ought to say and what it ought not, for the hands what they ought to do and what they ought not, for the feet whither they ought to go and whither they ought not, and for the mind what it ought to desire and what not. Now the things from which the laws deter men are not at all more agreeable or akin to nature than those to which the laws encourage them. Life and death are both natural; and their life results from things that are beneficial, death from those that are not beneficial. And with regard to things beneficial, those that are ordained by the laws are restraints on nature,

while those that are ordained by nature are free. What causes gladness then on a right view is of advantage to nature rather than what causes grief; and so what is pleasurable would be beneficial rather than what is painful. For the truly beneficial ought not to be injurious but advantageous. What is beneficial, therefore, to nature . . . those who . . . and who repel attack but do not themselves begin the aggression, and who are kind to their parents even when these behave badly to them, and who permit others to affirm on oath but do not do so themselves. Much of what has been mentioned would be found to be in opposition to nature; there is involved in it greater pain when less is possible, or less pleasure when more is possible, or injury when injury might be avoided. Now if those who adopted such courses as these had any protection from the laws, whereas those who did not adopt them but opposed them incurred loss, obedience to the laws would not be without advantage; but as it is, legal justice is found inadequate to protect those who adopt them. First of all it allows the injury of the injured and the aggression of the aggressor, and besides not originally preventing the injured from being injured, nor the aggressor from making aggression, on being held over until punishment is inflicted, it is no more favourable to the injured than to the aggressor.'

6-11. Cf. Xen. *Mem.* iv. 4. 12-13, where Socrates argues with Hippias of Elis that *ὁ μὲν νόμιμος δίκαιός ἐστιν, ὁ δὲ ἄνομος ἄδικος*.

7. Apparently *τα* has dropped out after [*πα*] *γτα*.

18-20 = Antiphon, Fr. 44 Diels, from Harpocration, s. v. *ἄγει*, *Ἀντιφῶν δ' ἐν τῷ Περὶ Ἀληθείας φησὶ τοὺς νόμους μεγάλους ἄγοι, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἡγοῖτο*.

20-2. *μονομενος* . . . *φυνσεως* is an iambic trimeter. Iambic rhythms occur also in ll. 113-15, 181-4, 272-4; cf. Jacoby, *op. cit.* p. 66.

34-6. Small curved brackets have been placed before and after the deleted letters, which have also been crossed through. The deleted paragraphus is only bracketed.

45. *τε*: l. *τι*. The mistake was probably caused by the following *εαν τε*.

49. The deleted *η* has a dot placed above it, and is crossed through with a light diagonal stroke. A similar method has been followed in ll. 66, 68, 149, 151, 166, 291; *δε* in l. 57 has only the overwritten dots; cf. l. 245.

68. Apparently the scribe inadvertently wrote *ουδεις*.

87 sqq. Since the author's contention is that legal justice is contrary to nature (ll. 59 sqq.), he might here be expected to say that what is encouraged by the law is not more in accordance with nature than what is prohibited, instead of vice versa. But apparently he is here regarding law as predominantly negative, and is thus concerned to show that prohibitions and restraints involve pain, and so are more akin to death than life.

89. The syllables *θρωπους* seem to have been originally omitted.

102-6. *απο* . . . *υπο*: the variation of prepositions appears to correspond to no real distinction of sense, and *απο* may be regarded as a clerical error.

108. l. *αλγυνοντα*: the final *a* was converted from *o*.

109. *τ* of *τε* is clear, but *γε* is required.

116. *τ[α η]δοντα*: cf. Ps.-Plat. *Ax.* 366 a *τὰ μὲν ἡδοντα ἀμυχιαῖα*, and Pollux iii. 98 *τὸ γὰρ ἡδῶ Ἴουκὸν καὶ τὸ ἦσε σπάνιον μὲν παρ' ἡμῖν, Ἀνακρέων δ' αὐτὸ εἶρηκεν* (Fr. 148). Some instances of the active occur in later writers.

126-30. The length of the lacunae at the beginnings and ends of the lines are calculated from l. 131, where the supplement is practically assured by l. 135. There will be two lines entirely lost above l. 126, if l. 131 was on a level with l. 99. In l. 128 the rough breathing is probable, but might possibly be an interlinear *ε*. In l. 129 the letter after *οι* may be *γ, η, μ, ν, π*, but not *τ*.

131-4. The antithesis of $\delta\rho\hat{\alpha}\nu$ and $\acute{\pi}\acute{\alpha}\sigma\chi\epsilon\iota\nu$, which is repeated in Cols. vi-vii, occurs in Antiphon, Fr. 58. ρ of $\delta\rho\alpha\nu$ was apparently inserted after the α was written, perhaps by the second hand.

148. $\tau\epsilon$: $\gamma\epsilon$ seems to have been originally written and subsequently altered, mistakenly. If the interlinear ν is rightly read, the insertor wished to read $\tau\epsilon\nu$ instead of $\tau\epsilon$. The first stroke of the ν is not clear, and the remainder of it is so much curved as to suggest a mark of short quantity above α of $\alpha\nu$ (cf. l. 113), but this would be unintelligible.

157. $\pi\rho\sigma[\iota]\epsilon\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota\varsigma$: l. $\pi\rho\sigma[\iota]\epsilon\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota\varsigma$; cf. l. 169. The same mistake occurs in l. 162.

165-6. The deletion of the ν at the beginning of l. 166 (cf. l. 231) is doubtless due to the corrector, who objected to the original division of the letters. Probably the word in question was $\alpha\nu$, which is sometimes divided $\alpha\nu$; cf. Crönert, *Mem. Herc.* p. 13. That the final ν of an adjective should have been carried over into the next line is much less likely. γ , μ , π or perhaps ι would be possible in place of ν in l. 165. $\tau[\omicron]\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ might be read in l. 166.

167. $\nu\nu\nu$ makes the supplement a little long, but this is preferable to the supposition of a lost line containing e. g. the words $\tau\hat{\eta}\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$.

188. The marginal δ is a stichometrical figure standing for 400. Stichometry, which is frequent in papyri of poetical works, is seldom met with in prose; cf. e. g. P. Grenf. ii. 11. ii. 4 and 852. Fr. 25, note.

189-94. This passage ought to be restored. In l. 189 $\pi\epsilon\rho\alpha\iota$, if rightly read, may be an illustration of Antiphon's tendency to poetic words; but perhaps the adverb is meant, as the scribe sometimes wrote iota adscript wrongly, e. g. ll. 151, 205. The ρ , however, is not altogether satisfactory, since a trace of the tail, if of average length, would be expected to be visible. The vestige of the top of the letter is consistent with τ , but there would barely be room for $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\rho\alpha\iota$ in the lacuna. The α at the end of the line may be δ . In l. 190 the doubtful \omicron may be ϵ ; $[\tau\omicron]\nu\varsigma\ \tau\iota[\mu\omega]\rho[\omicron]\nu\nu\tau$ suggests itself, but partial supplements are useless. In l. 193 $\alpha\pi$ and $\alpha\gamma$ are equally possible. The letter before $\delta\iota$ looks at first sight like γ , but this is probably due to a discoloured crack in the papyrus; $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\delta\acute{\iota}\kappa\eta$ does not occur. $\delta\iota$ might be read as $\alpha\lambda$, but $\alpha\lambda\kappa\eta\nu$ is less likely in this context.

203-7. As Murray suggests, the sense seems to be that the severity of $\tau\iota\mu\omega\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$ will depend on the persuasiveness of the accuser; but the connexion with the next three lines is not clear.

211. ν has apparently been converted from π .

219. A small smudge below ω is probably not a paragraphus.

225-7. These lines have been bracketed and crossed through in the same way as ll. 34-6.

231. The lower part of a diagonal stroke is visible below this ν (or μ), which was probably crossed out and transferred to the end of the previous line, as at l. 166.

245. Dots are placed above the letters to be cancelled, as in l. 57; that over ρ is uncertain.

264. A horizontal stroke stands above $\nu\varsigma$, to the right of which there is a curved mark like those used elsewhere in this papyrus for purposes of deletion; for interlinear strokes instead of dots cf. e. g. 843. The marginal note no doubt refers to the alteration in the text. $\omicron\nu\kappa$ was perhaps intended, though the suspension of the κ would be unusual.

266-98. 'We revere and venerate [the great], but the lowly-born we do not revere or venerate; for in this our conduct to each other is barbarized, since we are all by nature alike fully adapted to be either barbarians or Hellenes. We may see this from the needs which all men naturally have; in . . . no one is marked off as barbarian or Hellene. We all breathe the air with mouth and nostrils . . .'

266. Perhaps $\pi\sigma\lambda\rho\omega\nu$.

279. A short diagonal apex often attached by the scribe to the top of a vertical stroke appears in κ of $\kappa\alpha\iota$ in an exaggerated form.

285. π [: or γ].

286. $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$ was perhaps originally written by a lipography for $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\tau\alpha$.

299. This was probably the last line of the column, which is already longer than Cols. i-vi of Fr. 1.

Fr. 3. The rather dirty condition of this fragment and the next would suit a position in the first column of Fr. 2.

2. The remains suggest a rough breathing rather than a diaeresis on ι ; a breathing is of course consistent with a compound, e. g. $\alpha\lambda\upsilon\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ or $\sigma\upsilon\lambda\upsilon\epsilon\iota\varsigma$.

5. The broken letter before the lacuna seems to be by the second hand, in which case $\lambda\gamma\omega\nu$ probably ended the line.

Fr. 4. 1-2. Possibly what has been taken for vestiges of letters here is the effect of dirt, and l. 3 was the first of a column.

5. $\lambda\upsilon$ perhaps ended the line; cf. the preceding note.

6. The margin after the final α is slight, but most probably this was the last letter of the line.

Fr. 9. The comparatively small size of the letters indicates that this fragment, if it belongs to 1364, is from near the ends of lines.

1365. HISTORY OF SICYON.

29.4 × 10.8 cm.

Third century. Plate VI.

This interesting historical fragment consists of two nearly complete columns of 35 lines, written in a fine upright uncial hand approximating towards the biblical type (cf. 1392, which was found at the same time). Most of the letters are broad, but o is small and ϵ and σ narrow. ω is generally placed rather high in the line of writing. At the end of a line the letters are sometimes small. 847 (Part VI, Plate vi) is a specimen of this style on vellum (fourth century), but is somewhat later than 1365, which is likely to be nearly contemporary with 1234 (Part X, Plate iv) and P. Grenf. ii. 12 (Plate iii). These two papyri are in similar hands and have third-century cursive scholia, and we should assign 1365 to the earlier half of that century. An accompanying document was dated in the year 287. Paragraphi and two kinds of stops, the high and middle points, are employed, but the distinction between them is not accurately observed. A breathing in l. 15 and accents in ll. 31 and 60 with an interlinear insertion in l. 56 seem to be due to a corrector, but the diaeresis in l. 20 is by the original scribe. The lines are rather short, ranging from 13 to 18 letters and rarely exceeding 15, and the loss of the ends throughout Col. ii is not serious.

The subject of the fragment is the origin and rise of Orthagoras, tyrant of Sicyon during part of the first half of the seventh century B. C., and founder of a dynasty which brought that town into prominence in Greek history and maintained itself in power for about 100 years. Concerning this family, which belonged to the original Ionic inhabitants, not to the Dorian conquerors, very little is known, except with regard to the last ruler, Clisthenes, whose only daughter married Megacles the Alcmaeonid and became the mother of the Athenian reformer Clisthenes, a circumstance which gave Herodotus the opportunity for an excursus on the government of the Sicyonian (v. 67-8), besides the well-known story of the wooing of Agariste (vi. 126-31). Orthagoras with the other predecessors of Clisthenes has been hitherto little more than a name, and concerning even that there were doubts, since Herodotus ignores him, giving the genealogy of Clisthenes (vi. 126) as son of Aristonymus son of Myron son of Andreas. Aristotle, to whom Pollux (ix. 77) attributes a treatise called *Σικωνίων Πολιτεία*, briefly discusses the government of the Sicyonian tyrants (*Pol.* p. 1315 b, Bekker) *πλείστον γὰρ ἐγένετο χρόνον ἢ περὶ Σικυῶνα τυραννίς, ἢ τῶν Ὀρθαγόρου παίδων καὶ αὐτοῦ Ὀρθαγόρου· ἔτη δ' αὕτη διέμεινεν ἑκατόν. τούτου δ' αἴτιον ὅτι τοῖς ἀρχομένοις ἐχρῶντο μετρίως καὶ πολλὰ τοῖς νόμοις ἐδούλευον, καὶ διὰ τὸ πολεμικὸς γενέσθαι Κλεισθένης οὐκ ἦν εὐκαταφρόνητος, καὶ τὰ πολλὰ ταῖς ἐπιμελείαις ἐδημαγόγουν*, and elsewhere (p. 1316 a) treats Myron as the immediate predecessor of Clisthenes, *μεταβάλλει καὶ εἰς τυραννίδα τυραννίς, ὥσπερ ἡ Σικυῶνος ἐκ τῆς Μύρωνος εἰς τὴν Κλεισθέους*. Pausanias, however (ii. 8. 1; cf. vi. 19. 2), agrees with Herodotus in the order Myron, Aristonymus, Clisthenes, and concerning the first gives the valuable piece of chronological information that he won a chariot-race in the 33rd Olympiad (648 B. C.). Nicolaus Damascenus (Fr. 61), describing Clisthenes' accession, makes Myron, Isodemus, and Clisthenes brothers, assigning to them respectively 7, 1, and 31 years' rule, and speaks of Myron as *ἀπὸ Ὀρθαγόρου κατάγων τὸ γένος*, implying that he was not his son. Plutarch (*De ser. num. vind.* 7) connects the tyranny of Orthagoras with an oracle, *Σικωνίοις δὲ καὶ διαρρήδην ὁ θεὸς προεῖπε μαστιγονόμων δεῖσθαι τὴν πόλιν ὅτι Τελητίαν παῖδα στεφανούμενον ἐν Πυθίοις ἀφαιρούμενοι διέσπασαν. ἀλλὰ Σικωνίοις μὲν Ὀρθαγόρας γενόμενος τύραννος καὶ μετ' ἐκεῖνον οἱ περὶ Μύρωνα καὶ Κλεισθένη τὴν ἀκολασίαν ἔπανσαν*. Libanius (*Or. contra Severum*, iii, p. 251, Reiske) calls Orthagoras a *μάγειρος*, i. e. 'butcher', while Diodorus (*Exc. Vat.* viii. 24) applies that term to Andreas (cf. Herodotus), and gives another version of Plutarch's story about the oracle. By a curious chance this fragment of Diodorus connects closely with our papyrus, supplying the details which must have been given in the column immediately before Col. i; *ὅτι Σικωνίοις ἐχρησεῖν ἡ Πυθία ἑκατόν ἔτη μαστιγονομηθῆσθαι αὐτούς. ἐπερωτησάντων δὲ αὐτῶν τίς ὁ ταῦτα ποιήσων πάλιν*

ἀπεκρίθη, ᾧ ἂν καταπλεύσαντες πρώτῳ γεγενημένον υἷὸν ἀκούσωσιν. ἐτύγχανε δὲ τοῖς θεωροῖς ἠκολουθηκῶς τῆς θυσίας ἔνεκα μάγειρος, ὃς ἐκαλεῖτο Ἀνδρέας. μισθοῦ τοῖς ἄρχουσι μαστιγοφορῶν ὑπηρετεῖ. This being all the evidence that has survived concerning the predecessors of Clisthenes, even the outlines of their history are uncertain. Orthagoras and Andreas were regarded by K. F. Hermann as one and the same person, and most recent historians since Grote have preferred that view to the older one (e. g. Plass, *Die Tyrannis*, i. 137) that Andreas was the son of Orthagoras. It has been suggested (Abbott, *Hist. of Greece*, i. 370) that Orthagoras was only a nickname. Concerning Myron the statements of Herodotus and Pausanias are plainly inconsistent with those of Aristotle and Nicolaus, which are generally regarded as derived from Ephorus, like those of Plutarch and Diodorus, and while Plass (*op. cit.* i. 140-1) wished to reject Nicolaus' evidence about Myron altogether, most historians (e. g. Duncker, *Hist. of Greece*, ii. 400, Busolt, *Griech. Gesch.* i. 661⁴) insert a second Myron between Aristonymus, who perhaps never reigned, and Clisthenes. The chronology of the latter is fairly secure: he took part in the First Sacred War, won a chariot-race at the Pythian games in 582 B.C. (Pausanias x. 7. 7), and at Olympia probably not later than 568, since his daughter Agariste, who was betrothed to Megacles after the victory, apparently had a daughter of marriageable age about 550 (Hdt. i. 60 and vi. 126). Clisthenes probably died about 565, for Nicolaus (*l. c.*) assigns to him 31 years, and his anti-Dorian institutions continued in force for sixty years after his death (Hdt. v. 68), Sicyon being found in the Spartan league by 495 (Hdt. vi. 92). Hence the 100 years' period mentioned by Aristotle and Diodorus has generally been considered to point to about 665 as the date of the foundation of the tyranny (so Duncker and Busolt), though Plass, who (*op. cit.* i. 138) thought that revolutions might have occurred at intervals, preferred about 700, and Grote (iii. 37) 680-70.

The new fragment, continuing, as has been said, the story of the oracle in Diodorus, settles the question concerning his Andreas at any rate, who proves to be the father of Orthagoras. According to our author the Sicyonians, despising Andreas' low rank (he is called in l. 20 μάγειρος, as in Diodorus, and as Libanius calls Orthagoras), paid no attention to the prophecy that his son would be the future scourge of Sicyon, and Orthagoras was brought up in humble circumstances (ll. 1-22). On reaching military age he became a patrol (περίπολος), and distinguished himself in a war with the neighbouring city of Pellene, being promoted to the post of περιπόλαρχος, in which he won fresh successes and fame (ll. 22-52). After an interval, during which he seems to have become a democratic leader, he was elected polemarch, and carried on a victorious war (ll. 52-68). This resulted in the city taking some step (cf. l. 70,

note) which probably led directly to his seizure of supreme power, but at this point the papyrus breaks off. The story of Orthagoras is thus somewhat similar to that told by Nicolaus (Fr. 58) concerning the rise of Cypselus, who utilized his office of polemarch at Corinth to make himself tyrant, although Aristotle (*Pol.* p. 1310 b) states that Cypselus became tyrant not ἐκ τῶν τιμῶν but ἐκ τῆς δημαγωγίας. In the case of Orthagoras it appears that both causes contributed to his success, and probably the same is true of Cypselus. The distinctly favourable estimate of Orthagoras by our author harmonizes well with the praise awarded to the tyrants of Sicyon by Aristotle (cf. p. 105) and Strabo, p. 382.

The plain and straightforward but somewhat monotonous narrative of the fragment does not suggest an author who possessed very high literary merits. Hiatus is uniformly avoided. The writer is inclined to verbosity, especially in the long sentence in ll. 22 sqq., e. g. καταδραμόντων καὶ συμβα[λότων, πολὺ πάντ[ων ἠὺδο]κίμησε μά[λιστα] τῶν περιπ[όλων, ὀκειοῦτο κ[αὶ προσ]ήγετο, and displays a fondness for the genitive absolute (ll. 28, 34-6, 52, 61-8) and the repetition of the article with an adjective or other dependent words placed after a substantive (ll. 9, 57, 64, 69). For one expression, παρήλλαξεν ἡλικίαν (l. 24), there seems to be no precise parallel before the Roman period, but the general style of the fragment points to an earlier writer, and in view of the close connexion with Diodorus, Ephorus has the first claim to be considered. The extant quotations of Ephorus' own words are hardly sufficient to form a clear conception of his peculiarities, but he seems to have been rather verbose (cf. Walker, *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*, pp. 42-3), and Dion's criticism of his style as ὑπιον καὶ ἀνειμένον would apply to 1365. The tendency to repeat the article is not traceable in the fragments which are certainly attributed to him, and is much more noticeable in the *Hell. Oxy.* (842) and Theopompus than in the Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία, which has very few instances of it. There are one or two other points of resemblance in diction between 1365 and 842 (cf. notes on ll. 24 and 33), and the hypothesis of a common authorship is attractive on stylistic grounds. Ephorus presumably described the Sicyonian tyrants in Books vii-viii, of which extant fragments refer to the First Messenian War and death of Croesus, while Theopompus is hardly likely to have discussed early Sicyonian history, so that, if 842 and 1365 belong to the same work, the identification would favour Walker's view that Ephorus was the author of 842. That our fragment comes from the lost treatise of Aristotle on the Constitution of Sicyon is also possible, but on the whole less likely in view of the popularity of Ephorus and the marked agreement with Diodorus. Our author shows an interest in political history, but his reference to the internal politics of Sicyon (ll. 58-61) is rather vague, and he does not happen to mention the Dorian aristocracy who controlled three out of the four tribes. There are several points

of agreement with the language of the *Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία* (cf. ll. 21, 24, 26, 28, 40, 46-7, and 51, notes), though some of these consist in common expressions, and the praise bestowed upon Orthagoras in 1365 is quite consistent with the opinion expressed in the *Politics* (cf. p. 105); but the early history of the Sicyonian tyrant is more detailed than the corresponding account of the rise of Pisistratus, and the references to the Sicyonians by name in ll. 29, 43, and 69 rather suggest a work in which the affairs of Sicyon formed an episode than one which was wholly concerned with that city. Aristotle in the *Ἀθ. Πολ.* usually speaks of the Athenians as *ὁ δῆμος* simply or uses the plural without specification. Diodorus is not likely to be author of the fragment, still less Nicolaus or any other writer of the early Roman age, and what historians in the Alexandrian period described Sicyonian affairs is unknown. That 1365 is either a fragment of Ephorus or, at any rate, of a writer who was deriving his information from Ephorus, whether Aristotle or another, remains the most satisfactory hypothesis. We have now to examine the value of his account in connexion with the previously known evidence.

The circumstance that at length both Andreas and Orthagoras are mentioned by the same writer, and the Diodorus fragment is now shown to refer to Orthagoras' father, goes far to undermine the current opinion that there was a widespread confusion of the names of these two persons. Since Andreas was not himself tyrant, his omission by Aristotle and Plutarch is explained, and Libanius' transference of the term *μάγειρος* from him to Orthagoras is perfectly intelligible in the light of ll. 15-22. But the difficulty in Herodotus' genealogy of Clisthenes still remains. If Orthagoras was the son of Andreas, and Myron, the grandfather of Clisthenes, was really the son of Andreas, either Myron was the brother of Orthagoras, which is inconsistent with Aristotle's statement (cf. p. 105) concerning the *παῖδες Ὀρθαγόρου* (the term Orthagoridae is a modern expression), or else there were two persons called Andreas, the father and the son of Orthagoras, and Herodotus was referring to the second. In the case of Myron there is reason to suppose that there were two rulers of that name (cf. p. 106), and since Herodotus' Myron is clearly identical with Pausanias' Myron who won the chariot-race in 648 B. C., to insert a generation between him and Orthagoras would result in pushing back Orthagoras' accession nearly to 700 B. C., a date proposed by Plass on other grounds (cf. p. 106) which are not convincing. Cypselus became tyrant at Corinth in the middle of the seventh century (652 according to Busolt, 655 Grote), and Theagenes at Megara apparently about the same time, so that the Sicyonian tyranny seems to have been the earliest of the three despotisms of the Isthmus; but since Myron was contemporary with Cypselus, it is not at all satisfactory to suppose two generations

of tyrants at Sicyon before him, and if the 100 years' period (cf. p. 105) is at all correct, four generations of rulers are more suitable than five. The introduction of a second Andreas as well as a second Myron is therefore open to objection. On the other hand, the omission of the second Myron involves the rejection of the statements not only of Nicolaus but, what is more serious, of Aristotle, whose allusion (cf. p. 105) to the change from Myron to Clisthenes is quite compatible with Nicolaus' account of the murder of Myron by his brother Isodemus which resulted in the speedy accession of Clisthenes, the third brother. If Herodotus' Andreas, the father of Myron, is to be distinguished from the Andreas of Diodorus and 1365, we should prefer to abandon the supposed 100 years' period of the Sicyonian despotism. The evidence for it is not free from suspicion, being clearly connected, so far as Diodorus, i. e. Ephorus, goes, with the reputed oracle, while Aristotle's reference to it may well be derived from Ephorus. Plutarch moreover, who mentions the oracle but not the 100 years (cf. p. 105), seems to be guilty of an anachronism, for his story implies that the gymnastic contests at the Pythia's games had been instituted before Orthagoras' time, whereas they are generally considered to have been added during the Sacred War (i. e. after 590 or 586; cf. Duncker, *op. cit.* ii. 149). Recent historians regard the oracle as a later invention arising from the length of the rule of the Orthagoridae, but the number 100 is likely to have been due to the oracle, and its correctness is not confirmed by any evidence that is clearly independent. Herodotus, however, ought to have mentioned Orthagoras when giving a genealogy of the Sicyonian tyrants, and on the whole it seems more likely that his Andreas was identical with the father of Orthagoras in 1365, and that he has confused Orthagoras with Myron or with Andreas, than that τοῦ Ὀρθαγορέω has dropped out of the text in vi. 126 before τοῦ Ἀνδρέω. As Walker observes, his genealogy of the kings of Salamis in Cyprus (v. 104) contains a somewhat analogous inaccuracy, there being one generation too many.

Col. i.

[ο]ν[τ]α δημοτην κ[αι]
 φα[υ]λον τον ανθρω
 πον· παρημελησε
 του μαντειου· και τας
 5 μεν αλλας θυσιας τας
 [ε]πιταχθεισας εκ των
 [Δ]ελφων απεδωκε
 τοις θεοις· της δε τυ

Col. ii.

και συμβα[λοντων] εξ αι
 φνιδιου βο[ηθησας]
 απεκτειν[εν] των πο
 λεμιων τι[νας] και
 40 πολυ παντ[ων] ηυδο
 κιμησε μα[λιστα]
 των περιπ[ολων]
 ανθ ων οι Σ[ικωνι]

ραννιδος της μελ
 10 λουσης εσεσθαι κατε
 [φρο]νησεν. ο δε Αν
 δρ[ε]ας το γενομενον
 αυτω παιδιον ετρε
 φεν ονομα θεμενος
 15 Ορθαγοραν ος μεχρι
 μεν ηλικιας δ[ι]ετε
 [λ]εσε διαιτωμενος
 και παιδευομενος
 ουτως ωσπερ ην ει
 20 κος υιον οντα μαγει
 [ρου] και του τυχου[τος]
 [τω]ν πολιτων. επει
 δη δε την των παι
 [δω]ν παρηλλαξεν η
 25 λικιαν. γενομενος
 των περιπολων των
 [φ]ρ[ο]νουντων την
 [χω]ραν. πολεμου συν
 [ε]στωτος τοις Σικυω
 30 νιοις προς Πελλη
 νεας. ην μεν εν α
 πασι τοις καιροις ε
 ν[ε]ργος και χαριεις.
 [κ]αταδραμοντων
 35 [δ]ε των Πελληνε[ω]ν

οι περιπολ[αρχον αυ
 45 τον απεδει[ξαν ευθυσ
 δε τυχων τ[αυτης
 της τιμης ε[νικησε
 τους πολεμι[ους ετι
 λαμπροτερ[ον ωστε
 50 των πολιτω]ν πολλους
 οικειουτο κ[αι προσ
 ηγετο. και χ[ι]ρονου
 προελθουτο[ς ειλον
 το πολεμαρχ[ον αυ
 55 τον. μαλιστα [μεν δι
 α την ανδρι[αν και
 την ευτυχια]ν την
 κατα πολεμο]ν επει
 τα και το πλη[θος των
 60 πολιτων εν] [προς αυ
 τον ειχεν. π[ο]λε
 μησαντος δε κατα
 την αρχην ανδρειως
 την τε χωραν [την
 65 οικειαν δια]φυλα
 ξαντος. και π[ο]λλα κα
 κα τους πολε[μιους
 ποιησαντο[ς ο μεν
 δημοσ ο των [Σικυω
 70 νιων αυθι]ς

' . . . the people of Sicyon, knowing] the man to be one of the common folk and of no account, neglected the oracle, and while rendering to the gods the sacrifices enjoined by Delphi took no heed of the coming tyranny. Andreas brought up the child born to him, giving him the name of Orthagoras, and until he reached maturity he continued to receive the nurture and education natural for the son of a butcher and an ordinary citizen. After passing the age of boyhood, however, he became one of the patrols who guarded the country, and on the outbreak of war between Sicyon and Pellene he was active and agreeable on all occasions. When an incursion was made by the people of Pellene and a fight begun, he brought up reinforcements suddenly and killed several of the enemy.

and distinguished himself far above all the patrols. In return for this the Sicyonians appointed him chief of the patrols, and no sooner had he received this honour than he gained a still more brilliant victory over the enemy, thus winning over and attaching to himself many of the citizens. After a while they chose him as polemarch, chiefly on account of his courage and success in war, partly also by reason of the goodwill of the mass of the citizens towards him. During his office he fought bravely and kept close guard over his country, and inflicted much injury upon the enemy; whereupon the people of Sicyon again . . .

1. [ο]ν[τ]α: something like γνους (or αισθομενος) δε ο δημος ο των Σικυωνιων (cf. l. 69) probably preceded.

11. Ανδρ[ε]as: ν is practically certain, and the vestiges of the following letters suit δρ[ε]as very well. Cf. Diod. viii. 24 and introd. pp. 105-6.

16. δ[ιετλ]εσε: this verb occurs four times in 'Αθ. Πολ. with a participle.

20. μαγει[ρου]: cf. Diod. l. c. and p. 105.

21. του τυχο[τος]: cf. 'Αθ. Πολ. 27. 4 μᾶλλον τῶν τυχόντων ἢ τῶν ἐπεικῶν ἀνθρώπων.

24. παρηλλαξεν ηλικιαν: cf. Plut. *Alciḃ.* 7, *Cimon* 1, Heliod. x. 23. The verb occurs in 842. xix. 2 in the same sense, but with πεδίον, and twice in 'Αθ. Πολ. with μικρόν meaning 'differ'.

26. περιπολων των [φ]ρ[ο]υρουντων την [χω]ραν: cf. 'Αθ. Πολ. 42. 4 περιπολοῦσι τὴν χώραν.

28. πολεμου συν[ε]στωτος: cf. Αθ. Πολ. 24. 3 συνεστήσαντο τὸν πόλεμον.

33. χαριεις: cf. 842. i. 9 ὅσοι γνώριμοι καὶ χαριέντες ἦσαν.

40. ηυδο[κιμη]σε: cf. 'Αθ. Πολ. 14. 1 ὁ Πεισίστρατος καὶ σφόδρ' εὐδοκιμηκῶς ἐν τῷ πρὸς Μεγαρέας πολέμῳ.

44. περιπολ[αρχον]: cf. Thuc. viii. 92 ἐς τοῦ περιπολάρχου ξυνιόντας. Whether the termination was -ος or -ης is uncertain, but πολέμαρχος (cf. l. 54) is much better attested than πολεμάρχης.

46-7. Cf. 'Αθ. Πολ. 12. 5 εἰ γάρ τις ἄλλος, φησί, ταύτης τῆς τιμῆς ἔτυχεν.

51. προσ[ηγη]το: cf. 'Αθ. Πολ. 20. 1 προσηγάγετο τὸν δῆμον.

66. π[ολλα κα]κα τους πολε[μους] ποιησαντο[s]: cf. 842. xv. 31 τοσαῦτα κακὰ ποιήσαντες τοὺς Φωκέας, xviii. 36 οὐδὲν κακὸν ἐποίη[ε] τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας.

70. αυθι[s]: this must refer to something mentioned not long previously, and θεωρους (cf. Diod. l. c.) εις Δελφους επεμψε ογ πολεμαρχον αυτον ειλετο (cf. l. 53) may have followed. Σικυωνίων δῆμος (according to Pausanias vi. 19. 3) occurred in the dedicatory inscription upon the treasury built by Myron at Olympia after his victory in 648 B. C. (cf. p. 105); and that δημος here refers to the democratic party as opposed to the aristocrats is unlikely.

1366. FRAGMENT OF AN ATTIC ORATOR.

32.7 × 12 cm.

Late third century.

The recto of this papyrus contains a report by a decaprotus concerning payments of corn in A. D. 248-9, which will be published in Part XII. On the verso are the beginnings of lines of the ὑπόθεσις and first column of a speech by an Attic orator, preceded by the conclusion of a title]ογενους. The script is a large cursive, except the title, which is in uncials, and is probably not more than a generation later than the report. A paragraphus

after the *ὑπόθεσις* and a diaeresis occur, but no stops. The length of the lines is uncertain, but need not exceed an average of seventeen letters; cf. l. 6. A certain Antisthenes, who is not identifiable with any of the bearers of that name in the *Prosop. Att.*, is mentioned at the outset of the *ὑπόθεσις*, and from the words *φαρμακο* [l. 3], *θάνατος* (ll. 4 and 18), and *συκοφαντ* [ll. 7 and 13] it appears that the orator was defending, rather than prosecuting, some one on a charge of poisoning, but whether Antisthenes was the victim or the accused is not clear. There is no trace in the fragment of a reference to]ogenes, and the title may well belong to a preceding oration, since no Attic orator of such a name is known, and]ογενους in any case probably refers to a speech (either *ὑπέρ* or *κατά* being supplied) rather than an author. The extant titles of orations concerning persons called]ogenes are two by Hyperides, *κατὰ Ἀθηνογένους*, of which the first is partly preserved in a Paris papyrus, four by Lysias, (1) *περὶ τοῦ Διογένους κλήρου*, (2) *πρὸς Διογένην* or *κατὰ Διογένους* (*περὶ χωρίου*), (3) *πρὸς Διογένην ὑπὲρ μισθώσεως οἰκίας*, (4) *πρὸς Γλαύκωνα περὶ τοῦ Δικαιογένους κλήρου*, and one by Isaeus, *περὶ τοῦ Δικαιογένους κλήρου*, which is preserved entire. If the title in 1366 refers to the following speech, none of those orations is suitable; but if, as is more likely, it is distinct from the speech concerning Antisthenes, it might belong to one of them, preferably one of the two speeches by Hyperides or the second of the four by Lysias. The apparent use of *ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι* (l. 6) rather suggests Demosthenes; other orators, so far as can be judged, show a preference for *ὦ ἄνδρες* or *ὦ Ἀθηναῖοι* or *ὦ ἄνδρες δικασταί*, and were less commonly read than Demosthenes in the third century in Egypt. But the number of his speeches is given by a grammarian in Schol. Aesch. *De fals. leg.* § 18 as seventy-one, and since besides the sixty-one which are extant there are fragments of about twelve others attributed to him, none of which is suitable, it is very doubtful whether two more could be added.

Col. i.

κατα (?)]ογενους

Col. ii.

<p> <i>Αντισθενος</i> <i>φαρμακο</i> <i>και εαυτο</i> 5 <i>νατου κρη</i>) _____ <i>Καινον με</i> </p>	<p> <i>θα</i> <i>ω ανδρες Αθη</i> </p>	<p> <i>δικην</i> [<i>αι</i> <i>τιος θαυ</i>[ατου <i>τι πισθ</i> 20 <i>μενος</i>· [<i>ματω</i>[ν [.]<i>κω δε</i>[</p>
---	---	--

	ναιοι φιλ[συκο	ὑμιν ο[
	φαντ[αλ	μελει τ[
	λο τι κα[25 νους π[
10	εγωγ ου[νης τιν[
	και κατ . [τους μ[ω αν
	μενου[δρες γ[
	και συκο[φαντ		καμν[
	με ηδη [30 φιλος [
15	και γειν[τοι τω[
	τοι ταυτη[ν			

2. Αντισθενο[υς : Αντισθενε[ι is possible, but not Αντισθενη[ς.

22. δε[: or δο[.

28. The letter following δρες might be γ, η, μ, or ν, but not Α[θηναιοι.

1367. HERACLIDES LEMBUS, *Epitome of Hermippus* Περὶ νομοθετῶν.

Fr. 1 29.5 × 12.4 cm.

Late second century.

Papyrus rolls which had become worn through use were not infrequently strengthened with patches gummed on the verso, but such patches, even when inscribed, seldom have any value of their own. An exception is provided by the fragments here published, which were stuck on the back of 1248, part of a copy of Plato's *Politicus*. One of them (Fr. 2) shows that the work so utilized was the epitome by Heraclides son of Sarapion, commonly called Heraclides Lembus, of the treatises of Hermippus Περὶ νομοθετῶν, Περὶ τῶν ἑπτὰ σοφῶν, and Περὶ Πυθαγόρου, another (Fr. 1) contains one nearly complete column and part of a second from the end of Book i and the beginning of Book ii of the Περὶ νομοθετῶν. Hermippus, who is called by Athenaeus ὁ Καλλιμάχειος (i. 58 f, v. 213 f) and wrote after the death of Chrysippus (208–205 B. C. : Diog. Laert. vii. 184), was a voluminous biographical author, and the treatises above referred to are well known from citations; cf. *F. H. G.* iii. 36–42. Though divided into several books (the Περὶ νομοθ. had six, the Περὶ τῶν ἑ. σοφ. four, and the Περὶ Πυθ. two) and evidently self-contained, they are supposed to have been constituent parts of a larger whole called Βίολι. The new fact which emerges from the title in Fr. 2 is that these treatises were epitomized by Heraclides Lembus. This circumstance has a not insignificant bearing upon the disputed question concerning the character of Heraclides' compilation of the works of two other eminent

biographers, the Βίοι of Satyrus and the Διαδοχαί of Sotion. Heraclides was one of the authorities of Diogenes Laertius, who cites 'Ηρακλ. ἐν τῇ τῶν Σατύρου Βίων ἐπιτομῇ (viii. 40), 'Ηρακλ. ἐν τῇ Σατύρου ἐπιτ. (ix. 26), 'Ηρακλ. ἐν τῇ ἐπιτ. (following a reference to the Βίοι of Satyrus, viii. 53), 'Ηρακλ. ἐν τῇ ἐπιτ. τῶν Σωτίωνος Διαδοχῶν (v. 79), 'Ηρακλ. ἐν τῇ Σωτίωνος ἐπιτ. (viii. 7, x. 1). The natural inference from such a method of citation is that Heraclides' epitomes of the Βίοι of Satyrus and the Διαδοχαί of Sotion were two independent and self-contained works, and they were so treated e. g. by Müller in *F. H. G.* iii. 169-71. Diels, however (*Doxogr. Gr.* p. 149), following a suggestion of Hecker (*Philologus*, v. 433), has argued that the treatises of Satyrus and Sotion were digested by Heraclides into a single epitome, a theory accepted by Wilamowitz (*Antig. v. Karyst.* pp. 87-9) and Susemihl (*Alex. Litt.* i. 503), but rejected by Unger (*Rhein. Mus.* xxxviii. 494). Diels's objection to the common view, however, that Satyrus and Sotion had to some extent covered the same ground, and that it was useless to epitomize independently the same lives as given by the two authors, is conclusively met by the proof from the papyrus that Heraclides did not shrink from such repetition. Pythagoras was treated by Satyrus and Sotion, and Diogenes in dealing with his life expressly quotes Heraclides' epitome of them both (viii. 7, 40). Yet, as we now learn, Heraclides made an independent epitome of Hermippus Περὶ Πυθαγόρου. If Diogenes on the subject of Pythagoras had also referred to Heraclides ἐν τῇ 'Ερμίππου ἐπιτομῇ, would not Diels and his supporters have said that the same great compilation which comprised Satyrus and Sotion was meant? There would have been just as much or as little basis for this identification as for the other. Some at least of the seven sages, too, figured in the pages of Satyrus and no doubt of Sotion; and Satyrus must have included a number of νομοθέται. Since Heraclides epitomized these parallel treatises of Hermippus as such, it is reasonable to suppose that his procedure was the same in regard to Satyrus and Sotion, especially as that is the obvious deduction from the citations of Diogenes Laertius.

That this new information concerning the epitomizing of Hermippus by Heraclides together with a specimen of his compendium should have now come from Oxyrhynchus is appropriate and natural in view of the fact that Suidas calls him Ὀξυρρυγχίτης. This testimony conflicts with that of Demetrius Magnes *ap. Diog. Laert.* v. 94, which describes Heraclides as Καλλατιανὸς (Callatis in Pontus) ἢ Ἀλεξανδρεύς. The discrepancy has been met in various ways. Diels and apparently Wilamowitz (*l.c.*) accept Suidas and regard Demetrius as mistaken. C. Müller, Unger, and Susemihl effect a reconciliation by supposing that Heraclides was a native of Callatis, but lived at Alexandria at the court of Ptolemy Philometor, and also for some time as an official at Oxyrhynchus.

Crönert (*Colotes u. Menedemos*, p. 136) holds that Suidas and Demetrius have confused two persons, (1) Heraclides Lembos of Oxyrhynchus, statesman and historian, and (2) Heraclides son of Sarapion, of Callatis, epitomizer. The discovery of 1367 does not of course prove the correctness of Suidas; but it is a little unfortunate for Crönert's hypothesis that fragments of one of Heraclides' epitomes, instead of the *Ἱστορίαι* or the *Λεμβευτικὸς λόγος*, should have come to light at Oxyrhynchus.

The legislators discussed in the fragments are Demonax, Cecrops, Buzyges, Archimachus, and a personage at present unidentified whose fall is described in some detail in Fr. 1. 1-19. This last belonged to the Hellenistic age, as is clear from the reference in l. 6 to 'Ptolemy'. He was accused of peculation, fled to Corinth and was condemned in absence. The association with Egypt might suggest Demetrius of Phalerum, but he is excluded by the fact that Hermippus himself is the main authority for the statement that he died of snake-bite in that country (Diog. Laert. v. 78). It is, however, quite unnecessary to assume that the πόλις mentioned in l. 7 was an Egyptian city. The short account of Demonax (ll. 19-39) is unfortunately much mutilated; Hermippus disagreed with Herodotus, who is cited in l. 36, and later authorities in describing Demonax as king of Mantinea. At this point Book i ended, and with Book ii the writer turned to Athens. In the seven lines which remain concerning Cecrops a citation of Philochorus is noticeable in l. 47. Of Buzyges, the mythical ancestor of the Athenian Buzygae, we only learn that he was referred to in the poems of Lasus (ll. 54-5). By Archimachus (ll. 56 sqq.) the son of Heracles, whose name is usually spelled Archemachus, is probably meant. He was apparently brought into some connexion with a senate of 400 (ll. 65-6), but here again the papyrus is disfigured by lacunae which make the sense difficult to follow.

The text is written in a rather small hand, somewhat similar to that of 843 (Part V, Plate vi) but firmer and more regular. It is probably of much the same date as 1248, in the mending of which 1367 was used, and may be assigned like that papyrus to the latter part of the second century. The title in Fr. 2 is in larger letters with horizontal dashes between the lines. For punctuation both paragraphi and dots in the high position are employed; some at least of the paragraphi are apparently later additions, and the dots also are likely to have come from a second pen. The few corrections that occur are so slight or so imperfectly preserved that it is impossible to say with security whether they are due to the original scribe or to a diorthotes, and we have therefore as usual given the former the benefit of the doubt.

Fr. I.

Col. i.

Col. ii.

[. . .] α ^a . [. . . σ] υ ν τ [.
 [.] α [. . .] ι σ η δι[ο] και τινες
 δ[ι] κ[η] ν επηνεγκαν αυ
 [τ] ω εκατον και ενενη
 5 κο[ν] τα ταλαντων ως πα
 ρα [Πτο] λημαίου λαβοντος
 εις [τη] ν πολιν ταυτην
 δ α[πο] φυγοντος αλλην
 επη[νε] γκαν ταλαντων
 10 [εκατον] πεντηκοντα >
 [κ] α [ι ο μ] εν εις Κορινθον
 ωιχε[το] καταδικασθεις
 δε επ[ω] λειτο . προς >
 την κ[α] ταδικην μετα
 15 των υ[π] αρχοντων ουδε
 νος δε [τ] ων πολιτων
 ωνονμ[ε] νου ου τε αγροι
 διεφθαρησαν και η οι
 κ[ι] α συνεπεσεν Δημω
 20 ναξ ο βασι[λε] υς Μαντι
 νεων λεγε[ται] Κυρηναι
 [οισ] νομο[θε] τησαι και
 [ε] ς Δελφους [π]αραγενο
 [μ] εν[ος . .] . δι[δο] ναι τα >
 25 [.] . . . [. . .] ε . γρα
 [.] κ ε [.] συμμα
 [χ . . Μαντιν] εων [βα] σιλευς
 [ο Δημω] ναξ φ[. . .] . . [.
 [προ] σνιμας Βαρκαιο[ις
 30 [. . . .] . α . . . ιτε . [.] . [. . .
 [. . .] εν Μαντ[ιν] . . .

.

 50 ωσ[

[. . .] . α καθ εν α[. . .]κουν
 [. . .] . ον εξοντ[. . .]
 [. . .] Διβυην η[. . .] με
 35 [μ]νηται και του Δ[η]μω
 [να]κτος και Ηροδο[το]ς
 [ως υ]πο Μαν[τ]ινε[ων] >
 [δο]θειη Κυ[ρη]να[ιοι]ς εκ
 [θε]ο[ρο]πριου νοθ[ε]τ[η]ς
 40] β̄
 [Αθ]ηναι[ο]ις Κεκροπα του
 [δι]φυη και γηγενη βα
 [σι]λε[υ]οντα πρωτον
 [νομο]θετησαι φασι των
 45 [νομ]ων δ αυτου τους [. . .]
 [. . .] . δον ευδοκιμη []
 [σαι Φι]λοχορος δε τα τω[ν]

κον[.]α[.]
 κα . [.] . ανικησ[.]
 Βουζυγης νομοθετη
 σαι μεμνηται δ αυτου
 55 και Λασος ο ποιη[της]
 Αρχιμαχον δε φ[ασι θεσ]
 θαι τινας νομου[ς και
 [δι]ορθωσαι χρησ[τους δε
 [του]ς υπ αυτον τεθ[εν
 60 τας [.] . ν δε παραν[. . .
 ηνπ[.] . ν χρωμεν[. . .
]εσι[ο.] βα[σ]ιλικ[. . .]υνο[.]
]ατε . [. . .]ατο . ολ[. . .]να[
]ρωτ[. . .] . . ταυτην οτ[.
 65 [. . .]κην βουλευτα[ς
 . . τετρακοσιους . [.]

Fr. 2.

Ηρακλειδου του
Σαραπιωνος επ[ι]τομη
 των Ερμιππου περι
 70 νομοθετων και
ε[π]τα σοφων και
Πυθαγορου

Fr. 3.	Fr. 4.	Fr. 5.	Fr. 6.	Fr. 7.
.
]ξεν] . ρ[]εν[] . ν[]κο[
]φη] . σ[.
]θη >] . ιν[
]α προς	. . .			
. . .				

2 sqq. 'Certain persons therefore brought an action against him for a hundred and ninety talents on the ground that he had received this sum from Ptolemy for the city.

When he was acquitted of this they brought another for a hundred and fifty talents; whereupon he withdrew to Corinth. He was condemned and he and his property were put up for sale to meet the judgement, but as none of the citizens offered to buy them his lands became waste and his house went to ruin.

Demonax king of Mantinea is said to have given laws to the people of Cyrene, and going to Delphi . . . Demonax is also mentioned by Herodotus, who says that he was given as a legislator to the Cyrenaeans by the Mantineans in consequence of an oracle.

Book ii.

At Athens the double-formed earthborn Cecrops when he was king, it is said, was the first lawgiver, and of his laws the . . . were highly esteemed; but according to Philochorus . . . Buzyges (is said) to have given laws; the poet Lasus also mentions him. It is said that Archemachus promulgated some laws and amended others, and that the laws made by him were good . . .

(Title) Epitome by Heraclides son of Sarapion of Hermippus on lawgivers and the seven sages and Pythagoras.

1. It is not clear whether the superscribed *a* refers to l. 1 or is a displaced fragment.

6. 1. λαβοῦτι.

13. There seems to be an error here. επ[ω]λειτο is followed by a vertical stroke after which there is a small break in the papyrus, and beyond this a vestige of the π is visible before ρ. To interpret the vertical stroke as the forepart of the π is not at all satisfactory, owing to the height of the stroke and the width of the space beyond it. We prefer to suppose that a superfluous letter, or part of one, was written before προς. To read η (οικια) προς would involve an alteration of καταδικασθεις, and επ[ω]λει το () is not a very likely alternative.

17. Whether the overwritten ι was inserted by the original scribe or a corrector is doubtful; the υ has not been deleted.

19 sqq. Cf. Athen. iv. 154 d Ἑρμιππος δ' ἐν α' περὶ νομοθετῶν (*F. H. G.* iii. 36) τῶν μονομαχούντων εὔρετὰς ἀποφαίνει Μαντινεῖς Δημόνακτος ἐνὸς τῶν πολιτῶν συμβουλευσαντος, καὶ ζηλωτῆς τούτων γενέσθαι Κυρηναίους. Herodotus, who is cited below (l. 36), relates how, on the accession at Cyrene of the lame Battus, that state was bidden by the Delphic oracle to apply to Mantinea for a καταρτιστήρ, and the Mantineans accordingly sent Demonax ἄνδρα τῶν ἀστῶν δοκιμώτατον who τριφύλους ἐποίησέ σφεας and τῷ βασιλεῖ Βάττῳ τεμένεα ἐξελὼν καὶ ἱερωσύνας, τὰ ἄλλα πάντα τὰ πρότερον εἶχον οἱ βασιλεῖς ἐς μέσον τῷ δήμῳ ἔθηκε (iv. 161); similarly Diodorus viii. 30 ὅτι τῆς τῶν Κυρηναίων στάσεως διαιτητῆς ἐγένετο Δημόναξ Μαντινεύς, συνέσει καὶ δικαιούνη δοκῶν διαφέρειν. According to all these passages Demonax was a private citizen, and it is strange that he should here be given the title of king.

23-4. παραγενομενοι (sc. οἱ Κυρηναῖοι) would be expected from the narrative of Herodotus, but the following infin. indicates that Demonax is still the subject. δο[υ]ναι rather than δι[δο]ναι is wanted, but is apparently not to be read; the doubtful initial δ may be α.

26.]κε[: or possibly]ασ[.

32. Apparently not δ[ιοι]κουν. χ may be read instead of κ.

33. ἐξ ων is also possible.

34 sqq. Cf. note on l. 19. There are dots above και in both l. 35 and l. 36, but it is doubtful whether they were intended as marks of deletion, though the first και might probably be spared; for the second cf. l. 55. A small fragment containing part of the δ and the second ο of Ηροδοτος and a vestige of δ in the line above is not certainly placed here.

39. As in l. 17 the responsibility for the correction remains in doubt.

42. [δφυ]η: cf. Suidas s. v., Aristoph. *Wasps* 438, &c.

46. The letters before ν are indistinct, and there may have been some alteration; perhaps] . [.] ν should be read. The paragraphus below this line is of unusual length; it should, moreover, have been placed a line lower down.

53. Βουζύγης was the mythical ancestor of the Athenian priestly family of Βουζύγαι and was regarded as the inventor of ploughing and the originator of various moral observances; cf. e. g. Schol. Aesch. ii. 78 Βουζ. . . . Ἀθηναίων τῶν πάλαι, ὅστις πρῶτος ζεύγος ἐζευξεν, Hesych. Βουζ. ἦρως Ἀττικὸς, ὁ πρῶτος βούς ὑπὸ ἄροτρον ζεύξας, Etym. Magn. 206. 47, Append. Prov. i. 61 ἀραὶ βουζύγειοι· Βουζ. . . . ἄλλα τε πολλὰ ἀρᾶται καὶ τοῖς μὴ κοινωνοῦσι . . . ὕδατος ἢ πυρός ἢ μὴ ὑποφαίνουσιν ὄδον πλανωμένοις, Diphil. Fr. 62 Kock, Schol. Soph. Ant. 255 λόγος δὲ ὅτι Βουζ. Ἀθήνησι κατηράσατο τοῖς περιορῶσιν ἄταφον σῶμα.

54-5. This passage must be added to the scanty fragments of Lasus (four in Bergk's *Poet. Lyr.*).

56. Ἀρχίμαχος occurs as an Athenian name in Ps.-Demosth. Πρὸς Μακάρτατον 45, but no lawgiver Ἀρχίμαχος is known. Presumably the reference is to Ἀρχέμαχος, the son of Heracles by one of the daughters of Thespius (Apollod. ii. 7. 8), though apparently he is not elsewhere credited with νομοθεσία.

62-4. The letters $\epsilon\sigma$, $\alpha\tau\epsilon$, and $\rho\omega\tau$ are on a small fragment which is stuck on in the position given in the text, but is perhaps not in its right place. It is noticeable that the initial letters of ll. 63-4 are rather more to the left of the ϵ in l. 62 than is warranted by the ordinary slope of the column. The doubtful σ following the ϵ may be γ or π .

Fr. 3. 1. If] $\zeta\epsilon\nu$ is right this fragment might well belong to the passage concerning Buzuges; cf. note on l. 53. The ζ , however, is not altogether satisfactory.

Fr. 7. If this fragment belongs to 1367, it must have come from near the end of a line, on account of the compression of the letters.

1368. ROMANCE.

19.2 x 9.6 cm.

Third century.

The recto of this papyrus contains the ends of eleven lines from an official register of persons, drawn up, to judge from the handwriting, towards the close of the second century. A census and ἐπικεφάλαια are mentioned, and the document no doubt had reference to taxation. On the verso is the upper part of a column, with some letters from the ends of lines of the column preceding, from an apparently unknown romance. This is written in a medium-sized irregular hand, employing for the most part uncial forms but with a tendency to cursive; it is not likely to be later than about the middle of the third century. A paragraphus is once written, but no other kind of stop; ν at the end of a line sometimes takes the form of a stroke above the preceding vowel. Corrections in ll. 45-6 seem to be due to the original scribe. The fragment relates the adventures of a certain Glaucetes. During a ride he sees a vision of a youth who says that he and a maiden have been murdered and lie buried in a particular spot. Glaucetes then proceeds with his journey and arrives at a village where he prepares to pass the night. The piece is another illustration of the popularity

of such compositions, of which evidence has already come from Oxyrhynchus in fragments both of extant and non-extant authors ; cf. 416-17, 1019, 1250.

	Col. i.	Col. ii.
]νη	νιοις την αυτην θαψα[ι
]ενδε	μεικρον απο της οδου εκ[τρα
]τεν ῡι	30 πεις κειμαι δη ῡπο τη π[λα
]λιος	τανιστω εκεινη και μετ ε
5]δῑ εκει	μου κορη καλη αμφω ανηρη
]ην	μενοι ο δε Γλαυκετης εκ
]την	πλαγεις ωσπερ εικος εφθεγ
] . σι	35 ξατο μεν ουδεν προς ταυ
]τους	τᾱ επενευεν δε μονον και
10]παι	[αμ]ᾱ ηλαυνεν ο δε νεανι
	3 lines lost.	[σκος] ηφανισθη επινευσαν
		[τος ο] δε Γλαυκετης κατα κρα
		40 τος ηλαυνεν και αμα επε
]α	στρεφετο ει που αυθις ιδοι
15]α	εκεινον αλλ ουκετι εβλεπε̄
]σχυ	αφικνεται ουν νυκτος ετι
]ω̄	ε[ι]ς̄ την κωμην και ην πα
]νο	45 ρ αυτη πο[[λ̄]]αμος τουτον δι
]α	^{τινα} αβας ορα [[παρ αυτη]] ιπποστα
20]	σιν ανεωγμενην και εν
]κα	αυτη στιβαδα ευτελη και
]α	φauλην καταδησας ουν
]	50 προς τη φατην του ιππον
25]δε	βαλων αυτος επι της στιβα
]	δ[ο]ς̄ επεχειρει καθευδειν
]ν	καν τουτω κατεισι γυνη δι
] .	α κλειμακος η ην εξ υπερω
	. . .	55 [ου α]γουσα κατω εις την ιπ
		[ποστασιν . . .
	

Col. ii. " . . . to bury her, turning aside a little from the path. There I lie beneath that plane-tree and with me a fair maiden, both of us slain." Glaucetes filled with natural astonishment said nothing in reply to this, but merely nodding his head rode on; and when he nodded the young man disappeared. Glaucetes hurried on, turning round at the same time on the chance that he might see him again; but he beheld him no more. While it was yet night he arrived at the village, which was on the bank of a river. Crossing this he saw an open stable with a poor and mean litter inside; so having tied up his horse at the manger he threw himself down on the litter and tried to sleep. Meanwhile a woman descended by a ladder which led down from an upper room to the stable . . .'

28. The letter before the lacuna is probably *a* or *ε*. *θαψε[ι]ω* would fill the line better than *θαψα[ι]*, which is rather short.

46. The deleted letters, which are a dittography from ll. 44-5, have dots placed above and below them.

51. *βαλων*: cf. Arrian, *Epict.* ii. 20. 10 *βαλων καθευδε*. This intransitive use of *βάλλειν* (cf. *ρίπτειν*) is also found in poetry, and in the colloquial *βάλλ' ἐς κόρακας*, &c.

III. FRAGMENTS OF EXTANT CLASSICAL AUTHORS

1369. SOPHOCLES, *Oedipus Tyrannus*.

Fr. 7 4.4 × 8.1 cm.

Fifth century. Plate VII
(Frs. 1-2 recto).

These seven small pieces of three leaves from a papyrus book containing the *Oedipus Tyrannus* and no doubt other plays of Sophocles were part of a find of Byzantine literary fragments, which comprised 1369-74 and 1385, 1391, 1394, 1396-7 and 1401-3, besides a few very small unpublished fragments. Parts of fifty-six lines from the middle and later portions of the drama are preserved, nearly half being lyric, but too incomplete to be of much value. The script is a somewhat irregular sloping uncial of the oval type and probably belongs to the fifth century or the beginning of the sixth, being thus little later than 22, the only other extant papyrus fragment of this play. There were about forty-three lines on a page. A few corrections have been inserted in a different but probably nearly contemporary hand (ll. 780, 822, 1310) together with a breathing in l. 827 and the speaker's name in the margin of l. 689. The other occasional corrections and breathings, with the stops (high and low points), paragraphi, accents, diaereses, and marks of elision and quantity, seem all to be due to the first hand. Iota adscript is generally omitted. The scribe was rather careless, l. 778 being

omitted owing to homoioteleuton, and where the Laurentian codex (L) breaks down, as happens not infrequently in the choric passages, the papyrus (Π) rarely helps, so that the only novelties are ἐμβατεύσαι for ἐμβατεύειν in l. 825, a doubtful variant in l. 752, and an uncertain confirmation of an emendation in the corrupt line 1310. It is interesting, however, that in at least three instances (ll. 827, 1306, 1307) and probably a fourth (l. 1355) the text agrees with the later MSS. against L, thus providing a fresh argument on the side of those who do not regard L as the ultimate source of the other MSS. of Sophocles.

Frs. 1-4.

Verso.

- 688 [τουμον παριεις και καταμβλ]ύνων κεαρ [
 χορ(ος) [ωναξ ειπον μεν ο]ν
 690 χ' α[παξ μονον ισθι δε]
 [—]
 παραφ[ρονημον απορο]ν
 επι φρον[ιμα] πεφαν[θαι
 μ' αν [ει σε] νοσφιζομ[αι
 [ος τ εμαν γα]ν φίλαν
 695 [εν πονοις αλυο]ν
 [σαν κατ ορθον] ούρισας
 [τανυν τ ευπο]μπος ει δύναι γε[νου
 10 lines lost.
 708 [εμου πακουσον και] μαθ ουν[εκ εστι σοι
 [βροτειον ουδεν μα]ντικῆς [εχον τεχνης
 710 [φανω δε σοι σημεια τ]ῶνδε σ[υντομα

Recto.

Plate VII (Frs. 1-2).

- 731 [ηυδ]ατο γαρ ταυτ' ο[υδε πω ληξαντ εχει
 [και π]ου σθ' ο χωρος [ουτος ου τοδ ην παθος
 [Φωκισ] μεν η γη κλ[ηζεται σχιστη δ οδος
 [εσ ταυτο] Δελφῶν [καπο Δαυλιας αγει
 735 [και τις χρ]ονος τ[οισδ εστιν ουξ]ελληλυθῶς.
 [σχεδον τι προσθε]ν η συ τησδ ε[χων χθονος

[αρχην εφαι]νου τουτ' εκηρυχ[θη πολει
 [ω Ζευ τι μου] δρασαι βεβο[υλευσαι περι
 [τι δ εστι σοι τ]ουτ' Οιδίπους ε[νθυμιον
 740 [μηπω μ ερ]ωτα τον δε Λα[ιον φυσιν
 10 lines lost.

751 [ανδρας λοχιτας οι α]νηρ αρχηγετης
 [πεντ ησαν οι ξυμπ]άντες· ε[ν δ αυτοισιν ην
 [κηρυξ απηνη δ ηγε] Δάϊον μ[ια

.

Frs. 5 and 6.

Recto.

.
 775 [μητηρ] δε Μερ[οπη Δωρις ηγομην δ ανηρ
 [αστ]ων μέγισ[τος των εκει περι]ν μοι τυχη [
 777 [τοια]δ' επεστη θ[αυμασαι μεν] αξία[[ι]].
 779 [ανηρ] γαρ εν δείπν[οις μ υπερπλ]ησθεις με[θη
 780 [καλει πα]ρ' οινω· π[λα]στος ωσέ[ι]ήν πα[τρι
 [καγω βαρυνθεις την μ]εν ουσαν ημ[εραν
 [μολις κατεσχον θατε]ραι δ' ἴων πέλα[ς
 [μητρος πατρος τ ηλεγ]χον· οἱ δε δυσ[φορωσ
 [τουνειδος ηγον τω με]θέντι τον λ[ογον

.

Verso.

.
 819 [ωθειν δ απ οικων και ταδ ουτις αλ]λος ην
 820 [η γω π εμ]αυτω τασδ [αρας ο προστι]θεις.
 [λεχη δε] του θανο[ντος εν χεροιν] εμαίν.
 [χραιν]ω δι [[η]]νπερ [ωλετ αρ εφ]υν κακός.
 [αρ ουχ]ι πασ [[αν]] άγ[αγνος] ει με χρη φ[υγειν
 [και μοι] φευγοντ[ι] μ[η]τε [τους εμ]ους [ιδ]ειν
 825 [μηστ εμ]βατευσαι πατρ[ιδος η γαμοις με δει
 [μητρος ζ]υγηναι και [πατερα κατακτανειν
 [Πολυβον] δσ εξεθρεψ[ε καξεφυσε με

.

Fr. 7.

Verso.

1304 [δ]υναμαῖ σ ε[θελων πολλ ανερεσθαι

1305 πολλα πυθε[σθαι πολλα δ αθησαι

τοιαν φρίκη[ν παρεχεις μοι

αιαι αιαι

φεν φεν δύ[στανος εγω ποι γας

[φ]ερομαι τλ[αμων πα μοι φθογγα

1310 [δι]απ[^ω[[ε]]]τατ[αι φοραδην

Recto.

1351 [ποδιας ελαβεν μ απο τε] φ[ονο]ν

[ερρυτο κανεσωσεν ο]νθεν ες χάριν

[πρασσων τοτε]

[γαρ αν θανων]

1355 [ουκ ην φιλοισιν ουδ ε]μοι τοσονδ' άχο[ς

[θελοντι καμοι τουτ α]ν ην

[ουκουν πατρος]

[γ αν φονευς ηλθον ου]δε ν[υμ]φι[ος

688. καταμβλ[ύων] : so MSS., Jebb. Hartung and Wecklein proposed καταμβλύνεις.

689. χορ(ος), or possibly χορ[ο(ς)], is written as an ordinary abbreviation with a stroke through the ρ, not as in 1370. 1249 with ο above and ρ under the χ. Lines 689-97 are divided somewhat differently in L, which begins l. 690 with -παξ and l. 696 with κατ' ὀρθόν.

693. σε] νοσφιζομ[αι] : so MSS. Jebb adopts Hermann's σ' ἐνοσφιζόμεν.

695-6. Eleven letters would be expected in the lacuna in l. 695 and 10 in l. 696; the restoration of the reading of the MSS. gives 12 and 11, but with several narrow letters. πόνους in l. 695 was corrected by Bergk to πόνοισιν in order to correspond to φθίνουσα in l. 666 of the strophe, where Dindorf conjectured φθινάς, but the arrangement [εν πονοισιν αλ]ν[ουσαν κατ ορθον] requires 13 letters before ούρισας in l. 696, which is unlikely. In ll. 666-7 the reading of the MSS. τρύχει ψυχάν, καὶ τὰδ' εἰ κακοῖς κακά again fails to correspond to ἀλύουσαν κατ' ὀρθόν ούρισας in the antistrophe, and καί is generally omitted with Hermann. The papyrus supports the view that the error lies in the strophe, not in l. 696.

697. δυναῖ γ[ενου] or δυναῖο γ[ενου] can be read; the first hand of L had the former reading, the first corrector (with the other MSS.) the latter, something (two accents?) being

erased above *ai*. Neither reading corresponds to l. 668 τὰ πρὸς σφῶν. Hermann and Campbell read δύναιο, omitting γενοῦ, which word (or ἴσθι) would have to be understood.

740. ἐρ]ωτα τον: or possibly ἐρ]ωτᾶ [τ]ον; cf. l. 777.

752. ξυμπ]άντες was wrongly accentuated, unless a new variant, e. g. οὔτοι π]άντες, be read for οἱ ξυμπ]άντες: cf. l. 780, note.

777. The deletion of the wrong *ι* after *αξια* and the insertion of the mark of quantity seem to be due to the first hand. After this verse l. 778 σπουδῆς γε μέντοι τῆς ἐμῆς οὐκ ἀξία has been omitted owing to homoioteleuton.

780. There are traces of ink between the two accents on ἐ]ι and ἦν which apparently represent γ, i. e. γ(ε), or a smooth breathing. The scribe clearly either did not read πλαστός ὡς εἶην πατρί, which is indeed rather unexpected after καλεῖ μ', or else misunderstood it. The accent of ἦν must be wrong; cf. l. 752, note.

782. δ' was corrected from *ι* by the first hand. The supposed grave accent on ἴων resembles a mark of elision.

821. The *ν* of ἐμαῖν is written very large.

822. The reading of the first hand ηνπερ was a mere error.

823. ἀν[αγνος]: there is room for two more letters in the lacuna, which is hardly smaller than the space occupied by ωλετ αρ εφ in l. 822, and there may well have been another deletion. The first was apparently due to the original scribe.

824. φευγοντ[ι]: l. φυγοντ[ι] with A (the Parisinus). L originally had φυ . τόντι, which was converted into φυγόντι by the erasure of half the cross-bar of the τ as well as all the preceding letter.

μ[η]τε: so A; μῆστι originally L, corrected by an early hand to μήτε. μ[η]στ[ι] does not suit the traces here, and μ[η]στ[ι] cannot be read.

825. [μ]ηστ ἐμ]βατευσαι: μῆτ' ἐμβατεύειν LA, μῆτ' having been corrected in L by an early hand from μῆστ or μῆ μ'; μῆτ' or μῆ 'στ' ἐμ. other MSS., μῆδ' ἐμβατεύειν Dindorf, Jebb. The aorist fits in better than the present with φυγεῖν and ἰδεῖν in the preceding lines, but whether the papyrus had μῆστ' (cf. l. 824), μῆτ', or μῆδ' is uncertain. Seven letters would be expected in the lacuna on the analogy of ll. 823-6, six according to l. 827, so that [μῆτ' ἐμ] or [μῆδ' ἐμ] is rather short.

826. There was possibly a low stop after ζ[υγῆναι.

827. ἐξεθρεψ[ε καξεφυσε: so M (Ambrosianus) and the late MSS.; ἐξέφυσε καξέθρεψε LA, Jebb; but cf. *Od.* xii. 134 θρέψασα τεκοῦσά τε, and introd.

1304. δ]νναμαι σ ε[θελων: the reading is very doubtful, but the first letter visible seems to be *ι* or *υ*, the next to be *ν* rather than *δ*, and four feet are found in ll. 1305, 1306, 1308, and 1309. The arrangement of ll. 1304-10 is the same as that in L.

1306. τοιαν: so edd. with L marg. and some of the late MSS.; ποίαν L, τοίαν with π suprascr. A, &c.

1307. αιαι αιαι: so some of the late MSS.; αἰ αἰ αἰ LA, αἰ αἰ other late MSS., Jebb; cf. l. 827, note.

1308. The accent on δύ[στανος is not certain.

1310. The reading [δι]απωτατ[αι corr. from δι]απ[ε]τατ[αι is unfortunately very uncertain. LA have διαπέταται φοράδην], the only variants for διαπ. in the later MSS. being the corrupt διέπταται and διαπέπταται. The letter above the line is not *α* or *ε*, but might be *ο*. διαπωτᾶται, an epic form used also by Pindar, is adopted by Jebb from Musgrave and Seidler to preserve the anapaestic metre.

1351. LA also have φόνον at the end of this line, but ἐπιποδίας at the end of the line preceding. That the scribe of Π had no hesitation in dividing words between two lines is clear from ll. 689 and 695. The restorations in ll. 1351-2 are from L, but the text and metre of these lines are doubtful.

1355. ἀχο[ς: so A and edd.; ἀχθ[ος, the unmetrical reading of L, &c., is possible, but in view of the other disagreements with L less probable.

1357. οὔκουv πατρός . . . νυμφίος forms one line in L.

1370. EURIPIDES, *Medea* and *Orestes*.

Fr. I. 8.1 × 18.1 cm.

Fifth century. Plate VII
(Frs. 3 recto, 9 verso).

These nine fragments of seven different leaves from a papyrus codex of Euripides were found with 1369 and 1371-4. One belongs to the *Medea*, the rest to the *Orestes*, but the order of the plays is uncertain. The script is a good-sized uncial of the sloping oval type with thirty-seven or thirty-eight lines to a column, and resembles 1371. Fr. I (*Medea*) contains parts of fourteen iambic lines near the beginning of the drama (ll. 20-6, 57-63). Iota adscript is twice written by the first hand, twice omitted, but inserted by a corrector who used darker ink and to whom are due the breathing in l. 23 and frequent accents, stops (high, middle, and low points) except that at the end of l. 59, and marks of elision; diaereses and paragraphi are by the original scribe. The *Orestes* scraps, in the same hand, contain parts of nearly 100 lines scattered over the play, one-third being lyric (ll. 445-9, 469-74, 482-5, 508-12, 685-90, 723-9, 811-17, 850-4, 896-8, 907-10, 934-6, 945-8, 1247-63, 1297-1305, 1334-45, 1370-1). An insertion of iota adscript in l. 909 and a correction of l. 897 are made in a small uncial hand, which employed brown ink like that of the main text and seems to be different from that of the corrector of Fr. I, while the accents, breathings, stops (high point), and elision-marks are less frequent than in Fr. I and are probably due, like the diaeresis (l. 470) and most of the paragraphi, to the first hand. Corrections in ll. 1334 and 1342 and perhaps 511 are in a different hand, which may be identical with that of the person who inserted the speaker's name against ll. 470 and 1249 in good-sized uncials and paragraphi below ll. 1250, 1257, and 1260, but was apparently not the writer of the text. Two glosses in late fifth or sixth-century cursive, explaining rare words, occur in the margin of ll. 1370 and 1371. The writer of these notes may also have been responsible for the speaker's name against l. 1260, but the speaker's name added in uncials against l. 1246, if not due to the original scribe, was probably inserted by a fourth corrector. The cursive notes are somewhat later than the scholia in 1371, but the main text probably belongs, like the other literary fragments of this find, to the fifth century rather than to the sixth.

Like the two extant papyri of the *Medea* (ll. 5-12 in P. Didot, ed. H. Weil, *Monuments grecs*, 1879, 18-22, and ll. 710-15 in 450) the present fragment is too small to be of any practical use for textual purposes; but the pieces of

the *Orestes* are more valuable, being longer than the previously known papyrus fragments of that play (ll. 339-43 with musical notes in P. Rainer, *Mittheil.* v. 365; 1062-90 in J. Nicole, *Rev. de Philol.* xix. 105; 1313-50, 1356-60 in 1178), and in spite of their unsatisfactory condition offer some readings of interest. The *Orestes* is one of the best attested of Euripides' plays, the Marcian (M), Vatican (V), and two Paris codices (A and B) being available as well as the Laurentian (L) and the Laurentian part of the Palatine (P). Of these M, the oldest (twelfth century), is acknowledged to be the best, A and V coming next; P stands nearer to MABV than to L. A noteworthy agreement with M against the other MSS. occurs in l. 946, and with A in l. 1335, and probably in ll. 816 and 1370; on the whole the corrected text is fairly accurate, though a slip in l. 508 has passed unobserved. Weil's emendation ἄγ' for ἀλλ' in l. 1340 is confirmed, which is the more remarkable since 1178, though five centuries older than 1370, agrees with the MSS. A new reading which may be right occurs in l. 508.

1401, which was found with 1370, is also perhaps Euripides, but is written in a different hand and seems to belong to a distinct MS.

Medea.

Fr. 1.

Verso.

20 Μῆδεια δ' ἡ δυστήνος ἠτιμασμένη.
 βοᾷ μὲν ὄρκους ἀνακαλεῖ δ[ε] δ[ε]ξίας
 πίστιν μεγιστην· καὶ θ[εοὺς μ]αρτυρεται.
 δίας ἀμοιβῆς [ἐξ Ἰασονος κυρεῖ]
 κειται δ' ἀσι[τος σὼμ υφείσ αλγηδοσι
 25 τὸν πάντα [συντηκουσα δακρυοῖς χρόνον
 ἐπεὶ [π]ρ[ος ἀνδρὸς ἠσθετ ἠδικημενη

Recto.

57 ὠσθ' ἡμέρος μ' ὑπῆλθε γῆ' τε κουρανῶι
 λέξαι μολού[ση] δ[ε]υρο Μῆδείας τυχασ-
 ουπω γὰρ ἢ τα[λαινα π]αυεται γόων·
 60 ζῆλω σ' ἐν ἀρχ[ῆ] πῆμα κο]υδεπω μεσοῖ
 ὦ μῶρ[ος εἰ χρε] δεσποτας εἰπειν τοδε
 [ὡς οὐδεν οἶδε τῶν νεωτερω̄ν κα]κῶν·
 [τι δ' ἐστιν ὦ γεραιε μῆ φθονεῖ] φρασαι·

25. π of πάντα has been corrected.

58. μολού[ση]ι: so ABPV, edd.; μολούσαν V (later hand) L.

Μηδείας: so V (with ἡ δεσποίνης suprascr.) LP (cf. Ennius, *Med. Fr.* 3); δεσποίνης AB and Schol. *Phoen.* 1, Wecklein, Murray.

Orestes.

Frs. 2 and 3.

Recto.

Plate VII (Fr. 3 recto).

445 [ἰδία π]ρος [εχθ]ρ[ων η προς Αργείας χερσ
[παν]των προ[ς αστων ως θανω βραχυς λόγος
[ω μέ]λεος ἤκει[ς συμφορας ες τουσχατον
[εσ σ ε]λπιδις ἤμ[η καταφυγας εχει κακων
[αλλ αθ]λίως π[ρασσουσιν ευτυχης μολων

19 lines lost.

469 [θωμαι γερον]τ[ος ομμ]ατ[ων φευγων κορας
Τυνδ(αρευς) π[ου που θυγ]ατρος της εμης ἰ[δω ποσιν
471 Μ[ενελαον] επει γαρ τωι Κλυ[ταιμνηστρας ταφωι
χ[οας] χεομενος· εκλυον ὡς ἐς [Ναυπλιαν
ἤκοι συν αλοχωι πολυετης σ[εσωσμενος
ἀγετέ με προς γαρ δεξι]αν α[υτου θελω

Verso.

482 [τι γαρ φιλου μοι πατρος εστιν εκγ]ονος·
[κεινου γαρ οδε πεφυκε τοιουτο]ς γεγως·
[πεφυκεν ει δε δυστυχει τιμ]ητέος·

485 [βεβαρβαρωσαι χρονιος ων εν βαρ]βαροις·
[Ελληνικον τοι τον ομοθεν τιμαν αι]ι·

21 lines lost.

508 [ει τονδ αποκτει]νιεν σύλλεκτρ[ος γυνη]
[χω τουδε παις αυ μ]ητερ' ανταποκτει[ει
510 [καπειθ ο κεινου] γενομενος φονω φονοϋ [
[λυσει περας δε κα]κων [[ποι]] προβήσεται·
[καλως εθεντο ταυ]τα πατέρες οἱ παλαι·

Frs. 4 and 5.

Verso.

685 [συνεκκομιζειν δυναμιν η]ν δι[δω θεος
 [θρησκοντα και κτεινοντα τ]ους [ενα]ντι[ους
 [το δ αυ δυνασθαι προς θεων] χρ[ηζ]ω τυχ[ειν
 [ηκω γαρ ανδρων συμμαχων κεν]δον δο[ρυ
 [εχων πονοισι μυριοις αλωμενος]
 690 [σμικρα συν αλκη των λελειμμεν]ων φιλων

Recto.

723 [οποι τραπομενος] θαν[ατον Αργειων φυγω
 [ουτος γαρ] ην μοι κ[αταφ]υγη σωτηριας
 725 [αλλ εισο]ρω [γαρ] τον[δε φιλτατον βροτων
 [Πυλα]δην δ[ρομω στειχοντα Φωκεων απο
 [ηδε]ι[α]ν οψι[ν πιστος εν κακοις ανηρ
 [κρεισ]σων γα[ληνης ναυτιλοισιν εισοραν
 [θασσον] η [με χρην προβαινων ικομην δι αστεως

Fr. 6.

Verso.

811 [παλ]αι παλ[αιας απο συμφορας δομων
 [οπο]τε χρυ[σεας ερις αρνος
 [ηλυ]θε Ταν[ταλιδαις
 [οικ]τρότατα [θουναματα
 815 [και σ]φάγια γ[ενναιων τεκεων
 [φον]ω^ς φόν[ος εξαμει
 [βων δι] α[ιματος ου προλει

Recto.

850 [Πυλαδης εοικε δ ου μακραν οδ αγγελος]
 [λεξειν τα κειθεν σου κασιγνητου πε]ρι·
 [ω τλημον ω δυστηνε του στρατη]λατου
 [Αγαμεμνονος παι ποτνι Ηλεκ]τρα λόγο[υς
 [ακουσον ους σοι δυστυχεις η]κω φ[ερων

Frs. 7 and 8.

Recto.

896 [πηδωσ αι κηρυκες οδε δ αυτοις] φίλο[ς
]αισιν ι[
 [ος αν δυναται πολεος εν τ αρ]χ ην
 [επι τωδε δ ηγορευε Διομηδης α]ναξ
 8 lines lost.

907 [οταν γαρ ηδυ]ς τ[οις λογοις φρονων κακως
 [πειθη το] πλήθο[ς τη πολει κακον μεγα
 [οσοι δε συ]ν νω^ι χρηστα [βουλευουσ αι
 910 [καν μη πα]ραυτικ αυτι[ς εισι χρησιμοι

Verso.

934 [υμιν αμυνων] ουδε[ν ησσον η πατρι
 935 [εκτεινα μ]ητέρ [ει γαρ αρσεων φονος
 [εσται γυν]αιξ[ιν οσιος ου φθανοιτ ετ αν
 8 lines lost.

945 [ος ηγορευε συγγονον σε τε κτ]ανει[ν
 [μολις δ επεισε μη πε]τρ[ουμ]ενος θ[ανειν
 [τλημων Ορεστης αυτο]χε[ιρι] δè σφα[γην
 [υπεσχετ εν τηδ ημερ]αι [λ]ειψειν β[ιον

Fr. 9.

Fol. i verso.

Plate VII.

Ηλ(εκτρα) Μυκηνι[δες ω φιλαι

1248 τα πρωτα [κατα Πελασγον εδος Αργειων
 χορ(ος) τινα [θροεις αυδαν ποτνια

- 1250 π[α]ρ[α]μενει γαρ ετι σοι τοδ εν Δαναιδων πολει
στηθ̄ [αῑ] μεν υμων τονδ αμαξηρη τριβον
αι δ̄ [εν]θ̄[αδ] αλλον οιμον ες φρουραν δομων
τ̄[ι] δε με τοδε χρεος απυεις
ε[ννεπε μοι φιλα
- 1255 φοβο[s] εχ[ει] με μη τις επι δωμασι
στα[θεις] επι φονιον αιμα
πη[ματα] πημασιν εξευρη
[χωρειτ επειγωμεσθ εγω μεν ουν τριβον
- 1259 [τονδ εκφυλαξω τον προς ηλιου βολας
αλ]λο ημιχ(οριον) και μ[ην] εγω τονδ ος προς εσπεραν φερει
- 1261 δ[ο]χμια νυν κορας διαφερ ομματων
ε[κειθεν] ενθαδ̄ ειτα παλινσκοπιαν
εχομ[εν] ως θροεις
-

Fol. 1 recto.

- 1297 [ηκουσαθ ανδρες χειρ εχουσιν εν φο]ρωι
[Ελευνης το κωκυμ εστιν ως απεικασ]αι
[ω Διος ω Διος αεναον κρατος]
- 1300 [ελθ επικουρος εμοισι φιλοισι πα]ντως
[Μενελαε θνησκω συ δε παρων μ̄ ουκ ω]φελει[s]
[φονευετε καινετε]
[ολλυτε διπτυχα διστομα φασγανα]
[εκ χερως ιεμενοι]
- 1305 [λιποπατορα λιπογαμον α πλειστο]υς
-

Fol. 2 recto.

- 1335 ^τ
[[.]]λημων Ορεσ[της μη θανειν εμου θ υπερ
[επ̄ α]ξιοισι τ̄ αρ̄ [ανευφημει δομος
π[ερ]ι του γαρ αλ[λου] μαλλον αν φθεγξαιτο τις
[αλλ̄] ε[λθε] κα[ι] μετασχεσ̄ ικεσιας φιλοισ
[ση μ]ητρ̄[ι] π[ροσπεσουσα] τη μεγ̄ ολβια

Μενελα[ον ημας μη θανοντας εισιδειν
 1340 αγ' ω τραφ[εισα μητρος εν χερσιν εμης
 οικτειρον η[μας καπικουφισον κακων
 ω' εις αγω[να δευρ εγω δ ηγησομαι
 σω[τηριας γαρ τερμ εχεις ημιν μονη
 ι[δου διωκω τον εμον ες δομους ποδα
 1345 σ[ωθηθ οσον γε τουπ εμ ω κατα στεγας

Fol. 2 verso.

Plate VII.

1370 [πεφευγα βαρβαροις ευμα]ρισιν ειδος υποδηματο[s]
 [κεδρωτα πασταδων υπερ] τερεμνα η παστας
 π[ε]πο[υ]κιλμενο[s]
 [οι]κος

448. ημ[η]: so ABLPV, edd.; η γ η (γ in rasura) M. The breathing is very doubtful.

472. χεομενος: so ABLPV, edd.; χεύμενος M.

485. εν βαρ]βαροις: so ABLMPV, edd.; γράφεται ἀφ' Ἑλλάδος Mv and Apollon. Ty.

Erist. 34.

508. αποκτει]μιεν συλλεκτρ[ος]: l. αποκτεινειε συλ. The MSS. have ἀποκτείνειεν δμόλεκτρος, but σύλλεκτρος is a good Euripidean word; cf. *Her. Fur.* 1, 1268. Possibly δμόλεκτρος is a reminiscence of l. 476, where it has a somewhat different sense.

511. The initial lacuna ought to contain 13-14 letters, and ποι was no doubt omitted in its proper place by the first hand; the deletion of ποι after κακων is likely to be due to the corrector of ll. 1334 and 1342. δε ποι is read by all MSS. except L (δη πη) and a corrector of B (δε πη), and there is no reason to suppose an agreement with L here. δη ποι Wecklein, Murray.

686. This verse is bracketed by Wecklein following Hermann.

687. [το (ABMV) or [του (LP) can equally be read.

813. [ηλυ]θε Ταν[ταλιδαις]: so MSS. except L, which has ηλυθε Τανταλίδαισιν. The metre of this verse does not correspond to l. 825 of the antistrophe θανάτου γάρ ἀμφι φόβω, and Hermann proposed ὑπερ ἦλθε for ἦλυθε in l. 813, Murray ἀμφι φόβω θανάτου γάρ in l. 825.

814. οικ]τρότατα: so MSS., Wecklein, Murray; οἰκτρότατ' ἐς Weil. The vestiges of the last letter suit a better than ε.

816-17. The reconstruction is very uncertain. The MSS. have ὄθεν φόνω φόνος ἐξαιμειβων δι' αἵματος οὐ προλεί| (om. ὄθεν A), but l. 816 does not correspond to l. 828 of the antistrophe κτείνων σάν ματέρα μη πατρώ| (κτείνων with ὄρα suprascr. A). Triclinius proposed ἔνθεν for ὄθεν in l. 816, Hartung deleted σάν in l. 828, but neither emendation yields an exact correspondence. Neither οθε]ν nor τε|κεω]ν suits the vestiges of ink before φόν[so well as ω with ι added above the line, apparently by the first hand. Probably ὄθεν was omitted with A, but [. . .]ωι φον[ωι φονος can be read, and the vestige of a letter in the next line would suit ο or σ better than α, so that ἐξαιμειβων δι| αιματ]ο[s] is possible.

850. There is no trace of ink above πε]ρι. In ll. 852-4 23-4 letters are lost in the lacuna, but in 850 30, and in 851 29; these two lines spoken by the chorus therefore projected, although iambic. The ἄγγελος begins at l. 852.

897. At the end of the line the first hand wrote αρ]χη, which was corrected to αρ]χαισιν ην, the last word being altered to ηι, apparently by the same corrector. ἀρχαῖσιν ἦ MSS.

There may have been another variant earlier in the line, for the reading of the MSS. gives only 22 letters in the space which in ll. 896 and 898 is occupied by 25. *πλείστον* has been conjectured by F. W. Schmidt for *πόλεος* (v. l. *πόλεως*).

907. τ[οις, the reading of the MSS., was corrected to τ[ις by Musgrave. Lines 907-13 have generally been bracketed by editors following Kirchhoff, and ll. 916, 933, and 938-42 have been suspected, but they all either certainly or probably stood in the papyrus.

910. πα]ραυτικ: or πα]ραυτίκ. For αυτι[ς (i. e. *αὔθις*: so MSS.) cf. 1174. ix. 20 and note. There is a lacuna above the τ.

945. The papyrus is more likely to have had ηγορευε with ABM (Wecklein) than ηγορευσε with LP (Murray), since there are already 23 letters lost in the space which is filled in ll. 946-8 by 21.

946. πε]τρ[ουμ]ενος: so M, Wecklein; πετρουμένους ABLPV, Murray.

1247 sqq. Paragraphi were not employed by the first hand, but Electra's lines project beyond those of the chorus; the arrangement is right as far as l. 1259, but not from 1260-3. The subsequent insertion of paragraphi and of ἀλλο ημιχ(οριον) against l. 1260 brings the papyrus into harmony with the MSS., which apparently assign ll. 1258-9 and 1260 to different ἡμιχόρια, 1261-2 to Electra (L gives 1261 to the chorus), 1263 to the chorus (so Wecklein); Wilamowitz, followed by Murray, assigns 1262 to the chorus. Paragraphi may be lost below ll. 1259, 1262, and 1263, but hardly below 1261.

1250. π[α]ρ[α]μ[εν]ει γαρ: the MSS. apparently begin this line with γάρ, but the traces of the first letter suit π better than γ.

1305. The restoration, which follows the ordinary reading of the MSS., gives 27 letters in the lacuna, the corresponding space in l. 1297 being filled by 28, in 1298 and 1300-1 by 27. Since all the indications point to the lines in this column having begun evenly, unlike those in ll. 1247-63, it is improbable that before λιποπατορα the papyrus read ταν which is inserted by l and adopted by edd., or ε[ις] which is inserted by B²; but there would be room for θ' before α, as desiderated by Hermann.

1334. τλημων: so MSS. There has certainly been a correction, affecting perhaps the first three letters. The τ above the line is large, and probably due to the corrector of l. 1342 and perhaps 511, who is different from the corrector of 897; cf. introd.

1335. αξιοισι τ' αρ[: so A (τ' ἀρ'); αξίοισιν ἀρ' L, αξίοισιν ἀρ' B², αξίους τ' ἀρ' P, αξίοισιν γάρ MB, αξίοισι τ' ἀρ' Wecklein, αξίοισι τάρ' Murray.

1337. κά[ι]: so ABMP, edd.; om. L.

1340. αγ': Weil's emendation is confirmed; ἀλλ' MSS. and 1178, Wecklein, Murray. ἀλλ' has already occurred at the beginning of 1337 and is not wanted again here.

1342. ιθ' (so MSS.) was corrected from ωδ apparently.

1346 sqq. Since this column presumably had 37 or 38 lines like the rest, and the next column begins at ll. 1369-70, the papyrus no doubt included 1366-8, which are generally rejected on the authority of the scholium stating that they were interpolated by the actors.

1370. If, as is probable, ll. 1370-1 began evenly, most or all the letters of πεφευγα, which is usually assigned to 1369, must have come in 1370. βαρβάρους εὐμάρισι is the reading of A, followed by Wecklein; βαρβάρους ἐν εὐμάρισιν BLP (so Murray), βαρβάρουσι ἐν εὐμάρισιν M. The Etym. Magn. also read ἐν, but there is barely room for it in the papyrus unless πε|φευγα be read.

The scholium εἶδος υποδηματος refers to ευμ[α]ρισιν. A longer note beginning εὐμαρις εἶδος ὑποδήματος σανδαλώδους, occurs in schol. BM.

1371. τερεμνα: so ALP; τέραμνα BMV, Wecklein, Murray. With the scholium on παστάδων cf. Hesych. παστάς· οἶκος γεγραμμένος. Schol. BM have παστάδων δὲ τῶν κοιτῶνων.

After an interval of three lines there are below the α of τερεμνα what may be traces of ink, possibly the termination of l. 1376 αιθε]ρ α[μ or αιθερ] αμ.

1371. ARISTOPHANES, *Clouds* with Scholia.

10.6 × 12 cm.

Fifth century. Plate VII
(recto).

This fragment and the other pieces of Aristophanes in the present volume (1372-4 and 1402-3?) were discovered with 1369-70. Egypt has done little hitherto for the text of that poet, for none of the extant papyrus or vellum pieces is earlier than the late fourth century and nearly all are of slight value, the most interesting being the Hermopolis fragments of the *Acharnians*, *Frogs*, and *Birds* (*Berliner Klassikertexte*, v. 2, no. 18), which confirm six emendations but do not present a very correct text. 1371-4 together are somewhat more extensive than the Berlin fragments, with which they are probably contemporary, and exhibit much the same characteristics. That they belong to four different MSS. is not certain, the hands being very similar though not identical. The number of the page, which is preserved in the case of the *Wasps* (1374), indicates that that play stood probably seventh, and the four plays (*Clouds*, *Frogs*, *Peace*, *Knights*) represented in the other fragments may well have been among those which preceded the *Wasps*, as they do in the Codex Venetus (V) together with the *Plutus* and *Birds*. But since the text of 1374 differs from the rest in its marked support of V and the absence of corrections, and the number of lines in a column, so far as can be judged, varies considerably (37 in 1371, 39?-41 in 1372, 44 in 1373, 45-9 in 1374), while 1371 is distinguished by the presence of scholia, it is safer to regard the different hands as representing separate MSS. If any two of the four are to be combined, these would be 1373 and 1374, in both of which double dots are employed to mark a change of speaker.

1371 is the upper part of the first leaf of the *Clouds*, containing on the verso a few letters from the ends of ll. 1-11 and on the recto parts of ll. 38-48 in a good-sized, sloping uncial of the oval type. In the broad upper and right-hand margins of the verso are scholia on ll. 2-5 in a small uncial hand which is perhaps identical with that of the main text, and lower down is a gloss somewhat more cursively written than the scholia, but possibly by the same scribe. In any case these notes, which are in brown ink like the main text, are probably contemporary with it. Whether the longer notes occurred in the later columns except at rare intervals, if at all, is doubtful. Since l. 1 coincides with the top of a column (cf. 1373 in which a new play begins near the bottom of a column), it is quite possible that the *Clouds* was the first play in this MS.; in the Ravennas (R) and V the *Plutus* stands first, the *Clouds* second; but, while this is the fourth fragment of the *Clouds* obtained from Egypt (cf. Reitzenstein, *Hermes*, xxxv. 604 sqq. and

Berl. Klassikert. v. 2, no. 18. 2-3), no fragment of the *Plutus* has yet been found in that country. On the recto there are glosses in the left-hand margin, but in black ink instead of brown and in a certainly different semi-uncial hand; the upper margin has some brief notes on l. 52 in somewhat lighter ink by a similar but apparently not identical hand, while the speaker's name added also in light black ink before l. 38 is due to yet a third annotator of this column. A correction of the order of words in l. 47 was made, probably later than the glosses in the left-hand margin, by the writer of the notes at the top or by the writer of the speaker's name, and the same person may well have been responsible for the accents and breathings as far as l. 38, those in ll. 39-48 being apparently due to the original scribe, who also inserted the elision-marks, paragraphi, and occasional stops (high and middle). The notes in the various semi-uncial hands can be assigned with confidence to the fifth century, to which the body of the text is also likely to belong. The scholia in 1402 are certainly in a different hand.

The fragment (Π) is too short to show the quality of the text. A variation in the order of words in l. 47 which has been rightly corrected does not inspire confidence in a more legitimate variation of a similar character in l. 43. The original scholia on ll. 3-5, unlike the third-century commentary on the *Acharnians* (856), closely resemble the extant scholia, of which the older portions are derived from Didymus and other Alexandrian grammarians. In the fragmentary scholia on the *Knights* (late fourth or fifth century) published by us in *Mélanges Nicole*, p. 214, the agreement with the extant scholia is less marked than here. In some places the readings of Π are superior, but in general schol. R and V are fuller. The later notes have little or no connexion with the extant scholia.

Verso.

(1. 5) οι δ οικεται ρεγκουσιν ουτως οι Αττικοι δια του] κ' οι[κετα]ς υ[ν] ο[ν] τους
θεραποντας μονον λεγει αλλα παντας τους κατα την οικι]αν· κα[θευδ]ουσι μεν ον ο[ι]
αλλοι αυτος δε αγρυπνει και ρεγκουσιν επη]γαγεν [ι]να μαλλον αυ[του]ς δειξη πασης [
οντας εξω φροντιδος ιδιον γαρ των μηδεν φροντ]ιζοντων το βαθεως καθευδειν·

[ιου ιου

[ω Ζευ βασιλευ το χρημα των νυκτω]ν ὅσον

[απεραντον ουδεποθ ημερα γενησ]εται

[και μην παλαι γ αλεκτρουνος] ἤκουσ' εγώ

5 [οι δ οικεται ρεγκουσιν αλλ ουκ α]ν προ] του

[απολοιο δητ ω πολεμε πολλων ουνεκα]

ω Ζευ βασιλευ ουκ απλως χρη του[τ]ο
νομζειν ειρηκεναι τον ποιη[τη]ν
εχεται γαρ ιστοριας το ω Ζευ βασιλευ
τοιαυτης τοις Αθηναιοις Πυθοχρησ
5 τον εγενετο κατακλυσαι μεν τας
βασιλειας· προστησασθαι δε και σε
βειν Δια βασιλεια ωστε το λεχθεν της
ιστοριας εχεσθαι ταυτης χρη νομιζειν

[οτ ουδε κολασ εξεστι μοι τους οικετας]
 [αλλ ουδ ο χρηστος ουτοσι νεανιας]
 [εγειρεται της νυκτος αλλα περδεται]
 10 [εν πεντε σισυραις εγκεκορδυλημενο]ς
 [αλλ ει δοκει ρεγκωμεν εγκεκαλυμμέ]ν[οι

% ουδεποθ' ημερα γενησεται τουτο και
 10 οργιζομενος και υποκρινομενος
 δυναται λεγειν'

κατακεκαλυμμενος

Recto.

Plate VII.

(l. 52) / λαφ(υγμου) τ(ης) τρυφης η κενεσεως χρημ[ατων : Κωλ(ιαδος) ναος εοικως κωλοισ ?
 εν ω τιμαται η Αφροδιτη : Γενετελ(ιδος)]

+

Φειδιπ(πιδης) ^α έασον ^ω δαίμονιε κατ[αδαρθειν τι με
 σὺ δ' οὖν κάθεινδε· τα δ[ε χρεα ταυτ ισθ οτι
 40 ές τήν κεφαλήν άπαν[τα την σην τρεψεται
 καθ εαυτον φευ· ειθ' ώφελ' η προμν[ηστρι απολεσθαι κακως
 λεγει ητις με γημ' επηρ[ε την σην μητερα
 43 εμοι γάρ ην ήδι[στος αγροικος βιος
 ρυπαρος ευρωτιών ακόρ[ητος εικη κειμενος
 πλ[η]θων βρύων μελί'ταις [και προβατοις και στεμφυλοις
 46 έπειτ' έγημα Με[γακλεους του Μεγακλεους
 την θυγατερα ^β άγροικος ων αδ[ελφιδην εξ αστεως
 του αδελφου ^α
].. [σεμνήν τρυφω[σαν εγκεκοισυρωμενην

2. The marginal note (ll. 1-8) on ω Ζευ βασιλεῦ agrees nearly verbally with schol. RVΘ Ald., which have in l. 1 ἀργῶς for ἀπλως, l. 5 καταλῦσαι (rightly) for κατακλυσαι, l. 8 ταύτης ἔχεσθαι for εχεσθαι ταυτης. V also has in l. 1 νομίζειν τοῦτο for τ. νομ., Ald. in l. 2 τὸν ποιητὴν εἰρηκέναι for ειρ. τ. π., omitting το ω Ζευ βασιλευ in l. 3 and και σεβειν in l. 6, Θ Ald. Πυθοχρήστος for Πυθοχρηστον in l. 4, R omits μεν in l. 5, and RV at the end have an additional sentence with a quotation from Homer.

3. With the marginal note (ll. 9-11) on οὐδεποθ' ἡμέρα γενήσεται cf. schol. V τοῦτο και ὀριζόμενος δυναται λέγειν, where ὀριζόμενος is shown by Π to be an error for ὀργιζόμενος.

5. The note in the upper margin upon οἱ δ' οἰκέται ῥέγκουσιν corresponds closely to the extant scholia, Ald. having οὕτως Ἀττικαὶ διὰ τοῦ κ (οὕτως . . . κ om. RVΘ), οἰκέτας δὲ νῦν (νῦν οἰκέτας RVΘ) οὐ τοὺς θεράποντας μόνον (om. V) λέγει ἀλλὰ πάντας τοὺς κατὰ τὴν οἰκίαν. καθεύδουσι οὖν πάντες (καθεύδουσι νῦν, φησί R, καθεύδοντας V) ὡς τῶν ἄλλων μὲν (om. RV) ἀμεριμνούντων αὐτοῦ δὲ φροντίζοντος (αὐτὸν δὲ φροντίζοντι R). διὰ τοῦτο και τὸ (om. RVΘ) ῥέγκουσιν ἐπήγαγεν (εἶπεν RV) ἵνα μᾶλλον δείξῃ αὐτοὺς πάσης ὄντας ἕξω φροντίδος. τῶν γὰρ βαθέως καθευδόντων ἴδιόν ἐστι (om. R) τὸ ῥέγκειν (τῶν δὲ μηδὲν φροντίζόντων τὸ βαθέως καθεύδειν add. V and, with κοιμᾶσθαι for καθεύδειν, R). Π may have lost another line at the top, in which case the

beginning was different; but if the size of the lacuna in ll. 2-4 is correctly estimated, the opening sentence of schol. Ald. just fits the gap in l. 1. If l. 4 is to harmonize with schol. RV, about 30 letters must be added on to each line, for which there is hardly room, and which are not required in l. 2. Π seems to have omitted the first half of this sentence, just as schol. Ald. has omitted the second half. In ll. 2-3 Π seems to be somewhat shorter than the extant scholia, which in both R and V are corrupt. The use of ἐπίγαγεν in Ald. for εἶπεν in RV affords another point of contact with Π.

10. κατακεκαλυμμένος in the margin is a gloss on εγκεκορδυλημενο]ς. Schol. V has a long note which is partly found in R, explaining the word as ἐγκεκαλυμμένος καὶ συνεστραμμένος.

38. Above the paragraphus over εἶασον something was written by the first hand which looks more like a cross than ι with a stroke through it, or ψ. If it is more than a false start, it may be a critical mark. That it is a number referring to the page or quire is improbable.

39. δ' οὖν: so RVAG, &c., edd.; μὲν οὖν or οὖν other MSS.

40. ες: so R, edd.; εἰς V.

41. καθ' εαυτον λεγει refers to φεῦ; cf. schol. V ἰδία τὸ φεῦ and Ald. τὸ δὲ φεῦ ἰδίως. The ε of εἶθ' has been corrected by the first hand, probably from θ. ὠφέλ' is misspelled ὄφελ' by R. That ῆ had an accent as well as a breathing is not certain.

43. ἡδι[στος αγροικος: ἄγροικος ἡδιστος MSS., edd.; Naber conjectured ἄγρ. ἡσυχος. The order in Π does not appear to have been corrected (cf. l. 47) and may be right; but under the accent over η is in similar ink a short horizontal stroke which is difficult to account for, being unlike a breathing or letter. Perhaps another circumflex (cf. the preceding ἦν) was partly written by mistake.

44. The marginal ρυπαρος probably refers to ευρωτιῶν rather than to ἀκόρ[ητος. The scholia in a fuller note explain εὔρωτιῶν by εἰκῆ κείμενος, ἀκόρητος by ἀκαλλώπιστος.

45. πλ[η]θων refers to βρύων: cf. schol. R (not in V) αὔξων καὶ τεθλώς. Suidas s. v. ἀκόρητος adds καὶ πληθύνων, schol. Θ has θάλλων.

47. την θυγατερα του αδελφου refers to αδ[ελφιδην. Schol. Θ has τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ θυγατέρα. The MSS. all have ἀδελφιδῆν ἄγροικος ὦν, agreeing with the corrector, and the reading of the first hand, which separates ἀδελφιδῆν from Μεγακλέους τοῦ Μ. and gives no caesura, is a mere error; cf. l. 43, note. Above the α of αδ[ελφιδην is what may be a grave accent, but these are not employed elsewhere in the papyrus, and the stroke, which is very short, may be accidental.

48. The marginal note no doubt referred to σεμνήν or εγκεκοισυρωμενην, which are both commented upon in RV.

52. The note in the upper margin refers to this line δαπάνης, λαφυγμοῦ, Κωλιάδος, Γενετυλίδος. It is preceded by a critical mark which may have been repeated in the main text. τ of τ(ης) has a stroke through it like that through the φ of λαφ(υγμου) and λ of Γενετελ(λιδος). The form κένεσις for κένωσις is not known (κενώσις occurs in Pindar), and is probably a mere misspelling like Γενετελ(λιδος) in the next line, which, moreover, may well have contained the word γενεσεως. With the explanation of λαφυγμοῦ as τ(ης) τρυφῆς καὶ κενώσεως χρημ[άτων cf. schol. V ἀδηφαγίας καὶ πολυτελείας· τουτέστι ἐκδεδιητημένης πολυτελεῖ τροφῆ· λαφυγμὸν γὰρ λέγει τὸ ἀπλήστως ἐσθίειν, schol. Ald. τῆς περὶ τὰ ἐδέσματα πολυτελείας· τουτέστιν ἀσωτίας. λαφυγμὸν γὰρ κτλ., adding quotations from Eupolis and Homer, schol. R ἀδηφαγίας καὶ τῆς πρὸς τὰ ἐδέσματα πολυτελείας. In view of the scholium in Π, τροφῆ in schol. V is probably corrupt for τρυφῆ: cf. τρυφή καὶ πολυτέλεια in Xen. Memor. i. 6. 10 and schol. Brunck s. v. καταγλωττισμάτων (l. 51) εἰκότως δὲ ταῦτα καταλέγει δεικνὺς ὅτι αἱ εὐγενεῖς γυναῖκες ὑπὸ τῆς λῖαν τρυφῆς τοιαῦτα πράττουσι. Π, unlike schol. R Ald., explains λαφυγμός as waste of money, not gluttony, and the first part of the note in schol. V may have meant the same, for ἀδηφαγία, like λαφυγμός, is used in both senses.

Κωλ(ιαδος) ναος εοικως κωλοισ] εν ω τιμαται η Αφροδιτη: cf. schol. V Κωλιοι ναος τῆς Ἀφροδίτης οὕτω καλούμενος, ἀπὸ τοῦ συμβεβηκότος τὴν προσηγορίαν λαβών· νεανίας γὰρ . . . Κωλιάς δὲ ἐκλήθη ὅτι θύουτος τοῦ ἱερέως ἱερεῖον κωλῆς ἰέραξ ἤρπαξεν καὶ ἐπέκεινα (l. ἐπ' ἐκείνω with Suidas) τῷ τόπῳ ἐπεκαθίσθη. Schol. R is nearly identical, but in place of the last sentence adds Κωλιάδα δὲ προσηγόρευσε τὸν τόπον ἀπὸ τῶν κώλων ἃ ἐν τοῖς δεσμοῖς κατεπονείτο. Schol. Ald. has οἱ μὲν Κωλιάδα τὴν θεὸν καλοῦσι νεανίου Ἀπτικοῦ ἀποδράντος . . . οἱ δὲ τόπον εἰκότα κώλοισ ἀνδρός, ἔνθα ἡ θεὸς τιμᾶται. Whether Π had εοικως κωλοισ after ναος (or τοπος) is uncertain, but in any case the interpretation given by οἱ δὲ in Schol. Ald. seems to be meant.

Γενετελ(ιδος) [: l. Γενετυλ(ιδος). Something like δαίμων τ(ης) γενεσεως αιτιος probably followed; cf. schol. R δαίμων περι τὴν Ἀφροδίτην τῆς γενεσεως ἔφορος (αἴτιος Suid.), and schol. V οἱ μὲν τῶν περι τὴν Ἀφρ. ἀξιοῦσι θεῶν μίαν εἶναι διὰ τὸ γενεσεως αὐτὴν εἶναι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις αἰτίαν κτλ.

1372. ARISTOPHANES, *Frogs*.

Fr. 3 10.8 x 9.4 cm.

Fifth century.

These four fragments of two leaves from a codex of the *Frogs* were found with 1371 and 1373–4, with which they are probably contemporary though certainly in a different hand and probably from a different MS.; cf. 1371. introd. The script, like that of 1373, is more compact than that of 1371 and 1374, and is also distinguished by its form of λ which is often large and almost cursive. Parts of fifty-five lines are preserved from the early and middle portions of the play. Iota adscript is sometimes written. A correction in l. 855 is by a different hand which used black ink, and to the same person are probably due the occasional accents (in Fr. 1 only) and stops. All three kinds of points are employed, but not very accurately, since the middle point is used instead of the high at the end of l. 44 where there is a change of speaker. Marks of elision and diaereses are due to the first hand.

The text, like that of the Berlin fragments of this play (cf. 1371. introd.), is of slight interest, but tends on the whole to support the most ancient MS., R (tenth century). Agreements with R against V, &c., are found in ll. 847 (?), 852, 853, and 893, and with RV and the Ambrosianus (M) against the Urbinas (U) in ll. 857 and 891, while V, &c., are supported against R in ll. 890 and 894. Mistakes occur in ll. 887 and 890, and very probably in ll. 879, 891, and 892, as well as in ll. 888 and 897, where the MSS. too are corrupt and the error is now traced back to the fifth century.

Fr. 1.

Recto.

44 [ω δαιμονιε προσελθε δεομαι γαρ τι] σου·

45 [αλλ ουχ οιος τ ειμ αποσοβ]ησαι τον γελ[ων

[ορων λεοντην επι κροκω]τῶι κειμ[ενην
 [τις ο νους τι κοθορνος και] ρόπαλον [ξυνηλθετην
 [ποι γης απεδημεις επε]βατευον Κλεισ[θενει
 [καναυμαχησας και κα]τεδυσ[α]μεν γε [ναυς
 50 [των πολεμιων η δωδε]κ' ἢ [τρι]σκαίδ[εκα

Verso.

.
 85 [ποι γη]ς ο τλημ[ων ες μακαρων ευωχιαν
 [ο δε Ξε]νοκλεης [εξολοιτο νη Δια
 [Πυθαγ]γελος δε π[ερι εμου δ ουδεις λογος
 [επιτρ]ιβομενου τ[ον ωμον ουτωσι σφοδρα
 [ουκο]υν ετερ' εστ εν[ταυθα μειρακυλλια
 90 [τραγ]φδίας ποιου[ν]τα πλειν η μυρια
 [Ευριπι]δου [π]λειν η [σταδιω λαλιστερα

Frs. 2-4.

Verso.

.
 840 [αληθες ω παι της αρουραιας θεου]
 [συ δη με ταυτ ω στρωμυλιοσυλλεκτα]δη
 [και πτωχοποιε και ρακιοσυρραπτα]δη
 [αλλ ου τι χαιρων αυτ ερεις παν Δισ]χυλε
 [και μη προς οργην σπλαγχνα θερμηνης κοτ]φ
 845 [ου δητα πριν γ αν τουτον αποφηνω σαφως]
 [τον χωλοποιον οιος ων θρασυνητ]αι
 [αρν αρνα μελανα] παι[δε]ς ε[ξενεγκατ]ε
 [Τυφος γαρ εκβαι]νειν πα[ρασκευαζετ]αι
 [ω Κρητικας μεν σ]υλλεγων μονωδιας
 850 [γαμους δ ανοσιους] εισφερων εις την τεχνη[ν
 [επισχες ουτος ω πολυ]τιμη[τ] Αι[σχ]υλε.
 [απο των χαλαζων δ] ω πονηρ' Ευριπιδη
 αναγ[ε σεαυτον εκπο]δων ει σωφρονεις
 ἵνα μ[η κεφαλαιω τ]ον κροταφον σου ρηματι

- 855 θενω[ν υπ οργης εκχηη το]ν Τηλεφ[^οω]ν·
 [συ δε μη προς οργην Δισχυλ αλλα] πραονως
 [ελεγχ ελεγχου λ]οιδορεισθαι [δ ου πρε]πει
 [ανδρας ποιητας] ωσπερ αρτοπωλιδας·
 [συ δ ευθυς ωσπερ περι]νος εμ[π]ρη[σ]θεις β[ο]αις
 860 [ετοιμος ειμ εγωγε κουκ αναδυομαι]
 [δακνειν δακνεσθαι προτερος ει τουτ]ωι δοκει.

Recto.

- 879 ελθετ επη[.] δυναμιν
 880 δεινοτατο[ιν στοματοιν πορισασθαι
 ρηματα κα[ι παραπρισματ επων
 νυν γ[αρ αγων σοφιας οδε μεγας
 [χωρει προς εργον ηδη]
 885 [ευχεσθε δ]η και [σφω τι πριν ταπη λεγειν
 [Δημ]ητερ η θρ[εψασα την εμην φρενα
 [εινα]ι με των [σων αξιον] μαρτηρη[ων
 [επιθε]ς και συ δη λιβαν[ωτο]ν λαβω[ν καλωσ
 [ετεροι] γαρ εισιν οισιν ευχομα[ι θεοις
 890 [ιδιοι τι]νες οι κομμα κ[α]ινον κ[αι] μαλα
 [ιθι] δη προσευχου τ[.] . τ[ο]ισιν ι[δ]ιωταις θεοις
 [.] . [.] αιθηρ [[αι]]μον βοσκημα κ[αι] γλωσσης στροφιγξ
 και ξυνεσι και μυκτηρες οσφρ[αντηριοι
 ορθωσ μ ελεγχειν ων αν απτ[ωμαι λογων
 895 και μην η[μεις επιθυμουμεν
 παρα σοφ[οιν ανδρουν ακουσαι τινα λογων
 εμμ[ε]λ[ειαν] επιε δαι[α]ν [οδον
 γλωσσα μεν γαρ ηγριωται [
 λημα δ ουκ ατολμον αμφ[οιν ουδ ακινητοι φρενες
 900 προσ[δοκαν ουν ε]ικος ε[στι
 τον μ[εν] αστειον τι λεξαι και κατερρινημενον
 τον [δ] ανασπωντ αυτοπρεμνοισ

87. The doubtful π of $\pi[\epsilon\rho\iota]$ might be a low stop by the first hand.

846. A high stop may have been lost at the end of the line.

847. Before the final ϵ of $\epsilon[\xi\epsilon\nu\epsilon\gamma\kappa\alpha\tau]\epsilon$ everything is very uncertain, but considerations of space make it probable that Π had $\mu\epsilon\lambda\alpha\nu\alpha$ with R, Velsen, H(all)-G(eldart), not $\mu\epsilon\lambda\alpha\iota\nu\alpha\nu$ with VUAM, &c.

848. $\pi\alpha[\rho\alpha\sigma\kappa\epsilon\nu\alpha\zeta\epsilon\tau]αι$ or $-\tau]ε$. can be read; $-\tauαι$ MSS., edd.; but cf. l. 892.

851. $\text{Α}[\sigma\chi]υ\lambda\epsilon$. or, possibly, $\text{Α}[\sigma\chi]υ\lambda\epsilon;$, if the upper dot is not part of the ϵ ; but there is no change of speaker.

852. $\delta]$: so R, edd.; τ' M, om. VUA. That Π did not omit a conjunction is practically certain, for even with δ or τ there are only 15 letters in the space occupied by 18 in l. 851 and by 16 in l. 853.

853. $\alpha\nu\alpha\gamma]ε$: so R and most edd.; $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\gamma\epsilon$ VUAM, &c.

855. $\theta\epsilon\nu\omega]ν$: so RVUM and most MSS. ($\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\nu$) and edd. ($\theta\epsilon\nu\acute{\omega}\nu$); but $\theta\epsilon[\iota]ν\omega]ν$ (A and a few other MSS.) is possible.

857. $\pi\rho\epsilon]π\epsilon\iota$: so RVAM, H-G; $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\mu\iota\varsigma$ U, &c., Velsen.

859. $\epsilon\mu[\pi]ρ\eta[\sigma]θ\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ (RUM correctly) or $\epsilon\mu[\pi]ρ\iota[\sigma]θ\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ (VA) can be read.

861. $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau]ω\iota$: or, less probably, $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau]ω$.

879. $\epsilon\pi\eta].$: $\epsilon\pi\omicron[\psi\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota]$ (so MSS. except R $\acute{\epsilon}\pi'$ $\acute{\omicron}\psi\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$) cannot be read, nor apparently $\epsilon\pi\iota\omicron[\psi\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota]$ or $\epsilon\pi\epsilon]$. The arrangement of ll. 879-902 corresponds to that in RV, from which UAM differ.

881. $\rho\eta\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ (so MSS., Blaydes, H-G) has been altered by many editors ($\pi\rho\acute{\epsilon}\mu\mu\alpha$ $\tau\epsilon$ Velsen following Kock).

882. $\omicron\delta\epsilon$ (restored from the MSS.) is generally altered to $\acute{\omicron}$ by editors, following Hermann.

887. $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\eta\rho\iota]ων$ (i. e. $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\upsilon\rho\iota\omega\nu$) is a mistake for $\mu\upsilon\sigma\tau\eta\rho\iota\omega\nu$.

888. $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\sigma\upsilon$ $\delta\eta$ $\lambda\iota\beta\alpha\nu[\omega\tau\omicron]ν$ $\lambda\alpha\beta\omega]ν$: so Suidas (om. $\lambda\alpha\beta\acute{\omega}\nu$); $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\delta\eta$ $\sigma\upsilon$ $\lambda\iota\beta$. $\lambda\alpha\beta\acute{\omega}\nu$ R, $\lambda\alpha\beta\acute{\omega}\nu$ $\delta\eta$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\sigma\upsilon$ $\lambda\iota\beta$. VUAM, &c., H-G; a few MSS. have $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\sigma\upsilon$ $\lambda\iota\beta$. $\lambda\alpha\beta\acute{\omega}\nu$ or $\lambda\alpha\beta\acute{\omega}\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\sigma\upsilon$ $\lambda\iota\beta$. Π 's order lends some support to Fritzsche's $\lambda\iota\beta$. $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\sigma\upsilon$ $\delta\eta$ $\lambda\alpha\beta\acute{\omega}\nu$, which is adopted by Velsen.

890. $\tau\iota]ν\epsilon\varsigma$ $\omicron\iota$: $\omicron\iota$ is a mistake for $\sigma\omicron\iota$, the reading of VUA, edd.; $\tau\iota\nu\epsilon\varsigma$ $\sigma\omicron\upsilon$ R, $\tau\iota\nu\epsilon\varsigma$ $\sigma\omicron\iota$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ M.

891. $\delta\eta$: so RVM, Velsen, H-G; $\nu\acute{\iota}\nu$ UA Ald. After $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\epsilon\nu\chi\omicron\nu$ Π has three letters which are absent in the MSS. Possibly the scribe wrote $\tau[ο]ν\tau\omicron\iota\sigma\iota\nu$ $\iota[\delta\iota\omicron\iota\varsigma]$ ($\iota\delta\iota\omicron\iota$ occurred in l. 890) for $\tau\omicron\iota\sigma\iota\nu$ $\iota\delta\iota\omega\tau\alpha\iota\varsigma$. Only one dot is visible above the supposed ι .

892. $\alpha\iota\theta\eta\rho$ $\epsilon\mu\omicron\nu$ is the reading of the MSS., but besides $\alpha\iota\mu\omicron\nu$ originally for $\epsilon\mu\omicron\nu$ the scribe wrote four (perhaps only three) superfluous letters at the beginning of the line. Of these all that is left is the bottom of a vertical stroke which would suit γ , η , ι , κ , μ , ν , π , or τ , and may have been the initial letter. It is not certain that there was any writing at all between the doubtful α and $\theta\eta\rho$.

893. $\xi\nu\epsilon\sigma\iota$: so R, edd.; $\xi\acute{\nu}\nu\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ VUAM.

894. $\alpha\nu$ $\alpha\pi\tau]ω\mu\alpha\iota$: so VUAM, edd.; $\acute{\alpha}\pi\tau\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ R.

897. $\epsilon\mu\mu[\epsilon]λ[ε\iota\alpha\nu]$ $\epsilon\pi\iota\epsilon$: $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota\alpha\nu$ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\tau\epsilon$ RVUA, Velsen, H-G, $\acute{\epsilon}\mu$. $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota$ $\tau\epsilon$ M, Bekker. In the corresponding passage of the antistrophe (l. 994) the MSS. omit the word or words answering either to $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota\alpha\nu$ or to $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\tau\epsilon$ $\delta\alpha\acute{\iota}$, and Dindorf wished to omit $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota\alpha\nu$ here. $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\tau\epsilon$ $\delta\alpha\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$ $\acute{\omicron}\delta\acute{\omicron}\nu$ is not very satisfactory and was not the reading of the first hand of Π , who wrote $\epsilon\pi\iota\epsilon$ before $\delta\alpha\iota[a]ν$ [; but only the bottoms of the letters $\alpha\iota[a]ν$ remain, and there may have been a correction.

902. The \omicron of $\tau\omicron\nu$ seems to have been corrected.

1373. ARISTOPHANES, *Peace* and *Knights*.

Fr. I 8.5 × 17.3 cm.

Fifth century.

The larger of these two fragments found with 1369–72 and 1374 (cf. 1371. introd.) is the upper portion of a leaf containing on the verso ten lines from the concluding scene of the *Peace*, and on the recto ten lines from the opening scene of the *Knights*, the text of which began five lines before the end of the column on the verso. The order of the plays was thus different from both that in R, where the *Knights* and *Peace* stand fifth and sixth, and that in V, where the *Knights*, *Birds*, and *Peace* occupy the fourth, fifth, and sixth places. Illegible traces of what may have been the number of the page occur on the verso. The smaller fragment, which belongs to a much later scene of the *Knights*, is not quite certainly in the same hand as the other, for the letters are more spaced out, as in 1371 and 1374, while in the larger fragment the writing tends to be compact: The hand of 1374 is, however, distinctly larger, and on the whole it is probable that both fragments of the *Knights* belong to the same MS. The only stops found are double dots indicating a change of speaker. These are generally by the first hand where the change takes place in the middle of a line. Where double dots occur at the ends of lines (*Peace* 1328 and 1331), these are due to a corrector, who used darker ink and was also responsible in the *Peace* for the insertion of the missing syllable at the end of l. 1326 in a large cursive hand, the paragraphus after l. 1328, and the deletion of the repetition of l. 1329. The corrections in ll. 6, 7, and 9 of the *Knights* together with the paragraphi are also due to a corrector, but not certainly the same. A solitary (wrong) accent in l. 1334 of the *Peace* and a few other corrections are probably by the first hand, as are certainly the marks of elision and diaereses.

Of the *Knights* the only other papyrus fragment is one from Hermopolis containing parts of ll. 37–46 and 86–95 with scholia (late fourth or fifth century), edited by us in *Mélanges Nicole*, pp. 212–17, while the *Peace* has not hitherto been represented on papyrus; but 1373 (II) is too short to be of much value. The text is carelessly written and the corrector not very observant, as is shown by e. g. l. 11 of the *Knights*; but some errors of R are avoided. R is supported against V three times (*Knights* 7, 14, and 1058), V against R twice (*Knights* 8, 15). A small correction of the MSS. by Blaydes in *Knights* 1017 is confirmed, and perhaps another by Brunck in 1058.

Peace.

Fr. 1.

Verso.

- 1326 και τ[αγαθα] παντα οσα απωλεσαμεν
 συλλε[ξασ]θαι παλιν εξ αρχης
 ληξαι τ [αι]θωνα σιδηρον :
 1329 δευρο ω [γ]υναι εις αγρον
 [[δευρο ω γυναι εις αγρον]]
 1330 χωπως μετ εμου καλη
 κα[λως κ]ατακει[σ]ει :
 1332 υ[μην υμ]εναιε ω
 1334 [ω τρισμα]κάρ ω δικαι
 1335 [ως ταγαθα] γυν ε[χ]εις

1326. παντα οσα απωλεσαμεν : πάνθ' ὅσ' ἀπώλεσαμεν MSS. Above οσα a there seem to be some traces of ink along the edge of the papyrus, i. e. a page number.

1327. At the end of the line there is a smudge made by the corrector.

1328. τ : so RV, &c. (δ' C Ald.); but there is no sign of a cross-bar and the letter is rather close to the preceding ι, so that perhaps γ was written by mistake. The paragraphus inserted below this line by the corrector and the double dots here and in l. 1331 make Π correspond up to that point with RV, which assign ll. 1316-28 to the chorus, 1329-31 to Trygaeus, 1332 to a ἡμιχόριον, and 1334 to another ἡμιχ., omitting l. 1333 which was a repetition of l. 1332. Editors arrange and emend ll. 1329 sqq. in a variety of ways. The division of ll. 1332-5 in Π agrees with that in R, V combining 1334 with 1332 and 1336 with 1335.

1329. The repetition of this line, which is found only once in the MSS., was deleted by the corrector. Two instances of a similar repetition occur in ll. 1339-42 (τί δράσομεν αὐτήν and τρυγήσομεν αὐτήν), which are divided by V between two ἡμιχόρια, like the repetitions of Ὑμῶν Ὑμέναι' ᾧ in ll. 1336, 1346, 1351, and 1361. Dawes rejected ll. 1339-42, concerning which schol. V remarks ἐν τισιν οὐ φέρεται. But although the repetition of l. 1329 is no doubt wrong, it supports the view that ll. 1339-42 were found in Π, as well as the three concluding lines which stand in RV but are absent in many MSS. After the 10 extant lines of the *Peace* there is just room for 25 more lines (ll. 1336-end) arranged as in R (V combines them into 14), besides the first 5 lines of the *Knights* (cf. Fr. 1 recto); for since the normal column probably contained about 44 lines (cf. Fr. 2), there would still be a space equal to 4 lines available for the title.

1332. υμ]εναιε ω : for the absence of elision cf. l. 1326, but the papyrus is much damaged at the end of this line, and υμ]εναι ω (so RV) or υμ]εναιε is possible.

1334-5. ω δικαι[ως : l. ως δικ. with MSS. ω is due to the two preceding instances of ᾧ.

Knights.

Fr. 1.

Recto.

6 κακιστα δηθ' ουτος γε πρωτος Παφλα[γον]ων
 αυταις διαβολαις : ω κακοδαιμον πω[s ε]χεις
κακως καθαπερ συ : δευρο νυν προσε[λ]θ' ινα
 ξυναυλιαν κλαυσωμεν Ουλυμπου ν[ο]μο[s]^v
 10 μυμυ μυμυ μυμυ μυμυ μυμυ μυμυ
 τι κρνωρομεθ' αλλως υκ εχρην ζη[τε]ιν τι[ν]α
 σωτηριαν νων αλλα μη κλαιειν ετι
 τι [ο]ν γενοιτ' αν λεγε συ : συ μεν ουν μ[ο]ι λεγε
 ινα μη μαχωμαι : μα τον Απολλω γω [μεν ου
 15 [αλλ] ε[ι]πε θα[ρρ]ων [ε]ι[τα] καγ[ω σο]! φ[ρα]σω

Fr. 2.

Recto.

1013 [ως εν νεφελαισιν] αιετος [γενησομαι
 [ακουε δη νυν και] προσεχ[ε τον νουν εμοι
 1015 [φραξεν Ερεχθειδ]η λογιω[ν οδον ην σοι Απολλων
 [ιαχεν εξ αδυτοι]ο δια τριπ[οδων εριτιμων
 [σωζεσθαι σ εκελε]ν' ιερογ [κυνα καρχαροδοντα

Verso.

1057 [αλλ ουκ αν μαχεσ]αιτο [χεσαιτο γαρ ει μαχεσαιτο
 [αλλα τοδε φρασ]σαι προ Πυλου Πυλον ην σοι εφραξεν
 [εστι Πυλος προ] Πυλοιο : [τι τουτο λεγει προ Πυλοιο
 1060 [τας πυελους φ]ησιν κ[αταληψεσθ εν βαλανειω
 [εγω] δ' αλλ[ου]τ[ος] τημερον γενησομαι
 [ουτος γαρ] ημων τας πυελους αφηρπασεν

6. The ω of Παφλα[γον]ων seems to have been altered by the corrector from ο of the first hand. -ων MSS.

7. *αυταις*: so RP Ald., edd.; *αὐταῖσι* VAΓΘ. The first hand wrote *διαβολαῖσι* by mistake, a reminiscence of *αυταισι βουλαις* in l. 3; the corrector altered the final *ι* into two dots marking a change of speaker. The *ς* of *ε]χρῖς* seems to have been rewritten by the first hand in order to make it larger, in harmony with the other enlarged letters at the ends of lines.

8. *νν*: so V (*ννν*), A, &c. (*νδν*); *δῆ* R Vat.², Zacher, H-G.

9. The MSS. have *νόμον* with the corrector (so edd.), but Eustathius read *νόμφ*. It is not quite certain that the first hand wrote *ν[ο]μος*, but the final letter is not *ν*, *ω*, or *ι*.

11. *κνυρομεθ'*: l. *κινυρομεθ'* with AΓΘ; *κινυρόμεσθ'* RP, *κνυρόμεσθ'* V. The *κ* of *υκ* (l. *ουκ*) is badly written, being almost like *η*. *τι[ν]α*, if that was the reading, must have been rather cramped.

12. *ων*: so ΓΘPMΔ; *νῶϊν* VA, *νῶιν* R Vat.

13. *τι [ο]νν*: *τίς οὖν* RV with the other MSS. according to Blaydes and Zacher. Bekker has *τί οὖν*, apparently by a misprint. The traces do not suit *τι[ς] ονν*, and there is not room for *τι[ς ο]νν*, but *τι* may well be a repetition from l. 11. Π agrees with RV, &c., in having no change of speaker after *γένοιτ' ἄν*. Most editors make a change and rearrange ll. 13-16.

14. *να μη*: so R Ald. Vat., edd.; *ἴνα σοι μῆ* VA, &c.

15. [*αλλ*]: so VA, &c., edd.; om. R. Editors, following Sauppe, generally invert the order of ll. 15-16; cf. l. 13, note.

1017. *εκελε]ν'*: *έκέλευσ'* RV, &c., edd., *έκέλευσεν* AΘ. Blaydes had conjectured *έκέλευ'*, comparing the imperfect *έφραζεν* in ll. 1042, 1048, and 1058. The *ν* is not absolutely certain, but *εκελε]σ'* or *εκελευσε]ν'* cannot be read. In l. 1049 the MSS. vary between *έκέλευε* and *έκέλευσε*.

1058. *φρασ]σαι*: so most edd., following Brunck; *φράσαι* Rr²M, *φράζεν* VAΘ, &c. The *σ* is somewhat smaller than would be expected, and there may have been a correction. The letter comes above the *π* of *πυλοιο*, but the other *σ* may have been omitted, at any rate originally.

1060. *φ[.]ημισιν*: *φησί* MSS., *φησίν* edd. The letter before *ημισιν* was certainly not *φ*, but seems to have been deleted by the first hand, so that *φησίν* was probably meant.

1061. The deletion of the superfluous *λ* is apparently due to the first hand.

1062. This verse was rejected by Zacher.

1374. ARISTOPHANES, *Wasps*.

Fr. 1 17.7 × 12.8 cm.

Fifth century.

Of the various fragments of Aristophanes found with 1369-70 (cf. 1371. introd.) those of the *Wasps* are much the longest, portions of four leaves with more than 150 lines from the middle of the play being preserved. The script resembles that of 1371 and 1373. Fr. 2, but is larger and more irregular. There are no corrections except one in l. 609 made by the scribe himself, and, save for occasional double dots to indicate a change of speaker, no stops; but apostrophes to mark elision, &c., besides diaereses and paragraphi, occur. The page-numbers 19[5] and 196 are found on Fr. 1. No column is completely preserved, but Col. i had forty-five lines if ll. 475-6 were arranged, as is probable, like

ll. 486-7, and Col. ii may have had the same number, while in Cols. iii-iv the number increases to forty-seven or forty-eight. The next leaf is lost, and since Col. vii is for the most part lyric there is some uncertainty concerning the division of lines, which seem to have exceeded forty-six. In the last three columns a slight increase is discernible, Col. ix at any rate having apparently forty-nine lines. The leaf containing Cols. ix and x (pp. 203-4) was turned so that the recto came first, whereas the verso would be expected to occupy this position and correspond to the verso in Col. viii. Since approximately 9,200 lines have to be accounted for before Col. i, the *Wasps* is likely to have been the seventh play in this MS., as in V; cf. 1373. introd. In R it stood ninth, between the *Acharnians* and *Thesmophoriazusae*.

The text contains, as is usual in Byzantine literary fragments, a number of scribe's errors, but has several points of interest. The *Wasps*, like the *Knights*, is one of the plays in which V tends to disagree most with R, and the papyrus (Π), unlike 1372, strongly supports the former (cf. ll. 449, 456, 506-7, 511, 568, 570, 573, 613, 621, 749, 790, and 806?), except where V has made an obvious mistake (ll. 571, 608, 756, 796, 825-6, 865, and 875), and in l. 612? As compared with R, V in this play seems to be distinctly superior. A slight correction of the MSS. in l. 576 by Brunck on metrical grounds and probably another in l. 790 by Bergk are verified, but in ll. 452, 487, 749, 795, 802, 808, and 816 traditional readings which have been suspected are confirmed. New readings also occur in ll. 499 and 795.

The small fragment 1403 seems to be in the same hand as 1374, and its colour suggests that it belongs to Fr. 1, but we have not succeeded in identifying it.

Fr. 1 verso.

Col. i.

ρρ[ε

- 443 [πρ]ος βιαν χειρουσιγ [ουδεν των παλαι μεμνημενοι
 δε[ι]φθερω[ν καξωμιδων ας ουτος αυτοις ημπολα
 445 και κυ[νας και τους ποδας χειμωνος ουτος ωφελει
 ωστε μ[η ριγων γ εκαστοτ αλλα τουτοις γ ουκ ενι
 ουδ' εν [οφθαλμοισιν αιδως των παλαιων εμβαδων
 ουκ αφη[σεις ουδε νυι μ ω κακιστον θηριον
 ουδ' ανα[μνησθεις οθ ευρων τους βοτρυσ κλεπτοντα σε
 450 [π]ροσαγα[γων προς την ελααν εξεδειρ ευ κανδρικως
 [ω]στε σε ζ[ηλωτον ειναι συ δ αχαριστος ησθ αρα
 αλλ' ανε[ς με και συ και συ πριν τον υιον εκδραμειν

- αλλα τουτω[ν] μεν [ταχ ημιν δωσετον καλην δικην
ουκετ' εις μακραν [ιν ειδηθ οιος εστ ανδρων τροπος
455 οξυθυμων και δικα[ιων και βλεποντων καρδαμα
παιε παι' ω Ξανθια τ[ους σφηκας απο της οικιας
αλλα δρ[ω] τουτ' αλ[λα και συ τυφε πολλω τω καπνω
ουχι σ[ουστ] ουκ εις [κορακας ουκ απιτε παιε τω ξυλω
και συ [πρ]οσθε[ις Αισχινην εντυφε τον Σελλαρτιου
460 αρ' εμ[ε]λλομεν [ποθ υμας αποσοβησειν τω χρονω
αλλα μα Δι' ου ρα[διωσ ουτως αν αυτους διεφυγες
462 ειπ[ερ ε]τυχον τ[ων μελεων των Φιλοκλεους
βεβ[ρωκοτες
463 αρα [δητ ουκ αυτα δηλα
τοις [πενησιν η τυραννις
465 [ωσ λαθρα γ ελανθαν υπιουσα με]
ει συ γ ω πονω πονηρε και κομηταμνυια
τ[ων νομων ημας απειργεις ων εθηκεν η πολις
.

Fr. I recto.

Col. ii.

- ρ⁹⁵
- 486 [ουδὲ ποτε γ' ουχ εως []
[αν] τι μου λοιπον ηι
487 [οστις ημω]ν επι τυρ[αννιδ] εσταληις
[ωσ απανθ υμιν τυραννις εστι και ξυνωμοται
[ην τε μειζον ην τ ελαττον πρα]γμα τις κατηγορηι
490 [ησ εγω ουκ ηκουσα τουνομ ουδ]ε πεντηκοντ' ετων
[νυν δε πολλωι του ταριχους εστι]ν αξιωτερα
[ωστε και δη τουνομ αυτης ε]ν αγοραι κυλινδεται
[ην μεν ωνηται τις ορφως μεμ]βραδας δε μη θεληι
[ευθεωσ ειρηχ ο πωλων πλησιο]ν τας μεμβραδας
495 [ουτος οψωνειν εοιχ ανθρωπος] επι τυραννιδι
[ην δε γητειον προσαιτη ταισ α]φναισ ηδυσμα τι
[η λαχανοπωλις φησιν] παραβλεψασα θατερω
[ειπε μοι γητειον αιτε]ις ποτερον επι τυραννιδι

[η νομιζεις τας Αθην]ας σοι τρεφε[ι]ν ηδυσματα :
 500 [καμε γ η πορνη χθε]ς εισελθο[ν]τα της μεσημβριας
 [οτι κελητισαι κελεουν] οξ[υθ]υμ[ηθ]εισα μοι
 [ηρετ ει την Ιππιου καθισ]ταμ[αι] τυραννιδα :
 [ταυτα γαρ τουτοις ακο]υ[ειν ηδε ε]ι και νυν εγω
 [τον πατερ οτι βουλομαι] τουτω[ν] απαλλαχθεντα των
 505 [ορθοφοιτοσυκοφαντοδικο]ταλαιπωρων τροπων
 [ζην βιον γενναιον ωσπ]ερ Μορυχ[ος] αιτιαν εχω
 [ταυτα δραν ξυνωμοτης] ων και φρ[ον]ων τυραννικα
 [νη Δι εν δικηι γ εγω γαρ ο]υδεν ορνι[θων γ]αλα
 [αντι του βιου λαβοιμ αν ο]υ με υ[νν αποστ]ερης
 510 [ουδε χαιρω βατισιν ουδ εγχελεσιν αλλ η]διόπαν
 [δικιδιον σμικρον φαγοιμ αν εν λοπαδι] πεπνιγμενον
 [νη Δι ειθισθης γαρ ηδεσθαι τοιουτοις πρ]αγμασ[ι]ν [
 [αλλ εαν σιγων ανασχη και μαθηις αγω λεγ]ω [

Fr. 2 recto.

Col. iii.

.
 558 ας εμ [ουδ αν ζωντ ηδειν ει μη δια την προτεραν αποφυξιν
 τουτι π[ε]ρ[ι] τ]ων αντιβολουντων εστω το μνημοσυνον μοι
 560 ει γ' εισελθων αν[τιβοληθεις και την οργην απομορχθεις
 ενδον τουτων ων [αν φασκω παντων ουδεν πεποιηκα
 αλλ' ακρωμαι πασ[ας φωνας ιεντων εις αποφυξιν
 φερ' ιδω τι γαρ ουκ [εστιν] ακουσαι θωπευμ ενταυθα δικαστη
 οι μεν γ' αποκλοιου[τ]αι πεν[ιαν αυτων και προστιθεασι
 565 κακο προς τοις ουσιν εως ανιων αν ισωση τοισιν εμοισιν
 οι δε λεγουσι μυθους ημιν οι δ Αι[σωπου τι γελοιον
 οι δε σκ[ω]πτουσ' ιν εγω γελασω και [τον θυμον καταθωμαι
 καν μη το]υτοις αναπειθωμεσθα τ[α παιδαρι ευθυς ανελκει
 τας θηλ[ει]ας και τους υ[ι]εις τη[ς χειρος εγω δ ακρωμαι
 570 τα δε συ[γ]κηψαντ' αποβληχ[αται καπειθ ο πατηρ υπερ αυτων
 ωσπερ θεον αντιβολει με τρ[εμων της ευθυνης απολυσαι
 ει μεν χα[ι]ρεις αρν]ος φωνη [παιδος φωνην ελεησαι

ει δ' αυ το[ις] χοιρ[ιδι]οις χαιρω [θυγατρος φωνη με πιθεσθαι
 χήμ[ε]ις αυ]τω τ[οτε] της οργης [ολιγον τον κολλοπ ανειμεν
 575 αρ' ου [μεγ]αληι τ[ουτ'] εστ' αρχη [και του πλουτου καταχηνη
 δευτ[ερον αυ σου το]υτι γραφο[μαι την του πλουτου καταχηνην
 [και ταγαθα μοι μεμνησ] αχ[εις φασκων της Ελλαδος αρχειν

Fr. 2 verso.

Col. iv.

.
 607 [ασπαζωνται δια ταργυριον και πρωτα] μεν η [θυγατ]ηρ μεν
 [απονιξη και τω ποδ αλειφη και προ]σκυψασα φιληση
 [και παππιζουσ αμα τη γλωσση το] τριωβολον κκαλαματα
 610 [και το γυναιον μ υποθωπευσαν] φυστην μαζαν προ[σ]σενεγκηι
 [καπειτα καθεξομενη] παρ εμ[οι π]ροσαναγκαζη φαγε τουτι
 [εντραγε τουτι τοισι]ν εγω γα[ν]υμαι και μη με δεησης
 [εσ σε βλεψαι και τον τ]αμιαν οποτ' αριστον παραθησει
 [καταρασαμενο]ς και τονθορυσας αλλ' ην μη μοι ταχυ μαξει
 615 [ταδε κεκτημαι π]ροβλημα κακων σκευην βε[λ]εων αλεωρην
 [καν οινον μοι μη γχ]ης συ πιειν τον ονον το[νδ'] εσκεκομισμαι
 [οινου μεστον κατ εγχ]εομαι κλινας ουτο[ς δ]ε κεχηνωσ
 [βρωμησαμενος του σο]υ δινου μ[ε]γα και στρ[α]τιον κατεπαρδεν
 619-20 [αρ ου μεγαλην αρχην α]ρχω και τ[ο]υ Διουσ ο[υ]δεν ελατ'τω
 621 [οστι]ς ακουω τα[ν]θ' απερ ο [Ζε]υσ
 [ην γ]ουν ημει[ς θο]ρυβη[σ]ωμεν
 [πασ] τις φησιν [των] παρι[ο]ν[τ]ων
 [οιο]ν βρονται τ[ο δι]καστ[ηρι]ον
 625 [ω Ζε]υ βασι[λ]ευ []
 [κα]ν ασ[τραψω ποπ]πυζουσιν

Fr. 3 recto.

Col. vii.

.
 746 [α σου κελειοντο]ς ουκ' επ[ει]θετο
 747 [νυν δ ισως τοισι] σοις

- [λογοις πειθεται]
 748 [και σωφρονει με]ντοι μεθι
 [στας ες το λο]ιπον τ[ο]ν τροπον
 749 [πειθομ]ενος τε σοι
 [ιω μοι μο]ι
 ουτος τι βοας
 750 [μη μο]ι τουτων μηδεν υπισχ[νου
 κεινων εραμαι κειθ[ι γενοιμαν
 ἴν ο κηρυξ φησις τ[ις αψηφι
 στος ανιστασθω [
 καπισταιη[ν επι τοις κημοις
 755 ψηφιζομ]ενων ο τελειταιος
 σπευδ' ω [ψυχη που μοι ψυχη
 παρες [ω σκιερα μα τον Ηρακλεα
 μη νυ[ν ετ εγω ν τοισι δικασταις
 κλεπτ[οντα Κλεωνα λαβοιμι
 760 [ιθ ω π]ατερ προ[ς των θεων εμοι πιθου

Fr. 3 verso.

Col. viii.

- 790 [καπειτ] εγεθ[ηκε τρεις λοπιδας μοι κεστρεων
 [καγ]ω νεκαψ οβ[ολους γαρ ωομην λαβειν
 [κατ]α βδελυχθε[ις οσφρομενος εξεπτυσα
 [καθ] ειλικον αυτο[ν ο δε τι προς ταυτ ειφ ο τι
 [αλε]κτρυνονο[ς] μ [ε]φ[ασ]κ[ε κοιλιαν εχειν
 795 [ταχ]υ γουν καθεψεις γ' αργ[υριον η δ ος λεγων
 [ορας οσ]ον και τουτο δητα [κ]ερ[δανεις
 [ου πανυ τ]ι μικρον αλλ' οπερ μελλει[ς ποιει
 [αναμενε ν]υν εγω δε ταυθ' ηξω φ[ε]ρω[ν
 [ορα το χρημα τα] λογί' ως περαινεται
 800 [ηκηκοειν γαρ ως Α]θηναιοι ποτε
 [δικασοιεν επι ταις οι]κειαισι τας δικας [
 [καν τοις προθυροις ενοι]κοδομησει π[ας ανηρ
 [αυτω δικαστηριδιον μ]ικρον πανυ

[ὡσπερ Ἐκαταίων παντα]χου προ των θυρων [
 805 [ιδου τι ετ ερεις ως απαντ] εγω φερω
 [οσαπερ εφασκον κατι πολλ]ωι πλειονα
 [αμιν μεν ην ουρητιασης αυ]τηι
 [παρα σοι κρεμησεται εγγυς ε]πι [του πατταλου

Frs. 4 and 5 recto. Col. ix.

814 [αυτου με]γων [γαρ την φακην ροφησομαι
 815 [αταρ τι τ]ον ορ[νιν ως εμ εξηνεγκατε
 [ινα γ η]ν καθε[υδης απολογουμενου τινος
 [αδων α]νωθε[ν εξεγειρη σ ουτοσι
 [εν ετι πο]θω τα δ [αλλ αρεσκει μοι το τι
 [θηρων] ει πως ε[κκομισαις το του Λυκου
 5 lines lost.
 825 ε[καλουν καλει νυν ως καθημ εγω παλαι
 φ[ερε νυν τιν αυτω πρωτον εισαγαγω δικην
 τ[ι τις κακον δεδρακε των εν τωκια
 η [Θραττα προσκαυσασα πρωην την χυτραν
 ε[πισχες ουτος ως ολιγου μ απωλεσας
 830 α[νευ δρυφακτου την δικην μελλεις καλειν

Frs. 4 and 5 verso. Col. x.

.
 863 [και μην ημεις επι] ταις [σπονδαις
 [και ταις ευχαις]
 865 [φημην αγαθην λεξο]μεν υμ[ιν
 [οτι γενναιως εκ του π]ολεμο[υ
 [και του νεικους ξυ]νβεητο[υ
 [ευφημια μεν πρωτα νυν] υπαρχ[ετω
 [ω Φοιβ Απολλον Πυθι επ αγ]αθη τ[υχη
 5 lines lost.
 875 [ω δεσποτ αναξ γειτον αγνιεν τουμου προθυ]ρο[υ προσφυλας
 [δεξαι τελετην καινην ωναξ ην τω πατρι και]γοτομο[υμεν

[παυσον τ αυτου τουτο το λιαν στρυφνον και] πρινινο[ν ηθος
[αντι σιραιου μελιτος μικρον τω θυμιδιω παρα]μιξας

444. δε[ι]φθερω[ν, or perhaps [δ]ιαφθερω[ν, is for διφθερων.
449. ουδ': so V, &c., edd.; οὐτ' R.
452. ανε[ς]: so MSS., H(all)-G(eldart); ἄφες Cobet.
453. τουτω[ν]: so MSS. and most edd. The v.l. τούτω is implied by the scholia.
454. εις: ἐς RV, edd.
456. παιε: so VΓ, &c., edd.; παῦε R.
459. The MSS. assign this line not to the speaker of l. 458 (Sosias), but to a different person (οἰκέτης R, Xanthias V), and generally give l. 460 to him also (so most edd.). R, however, supports Π in marking a new speaker after l. 459. Π probably assigned ll. 458-9 to Bdelycleon, 460 to Xanthias or Sosias; Bergk gave l. 456 to Sosias, 457-9 to Bdelycleon, 460 to Xanthias.
462. βεβ[ρωκοτες which belongs to this verse was put in a line by itself, perhaps for want of space.
465. This line, which would be expected to correspond to the two preceding, is corrupt in the MSS.
486-7. Π agrees with RV in its division of these lines. There is no room before εσταλης for ωδ' which is commonly inserted on metrical grounds (cf. l. 429) by editors, following Hermann.
496. ταις ἀφουαις: it is uncertain whether Π had ταις (so MSS., Starkie, H-G) or τις (Brunck on metrical grounds), especially as προσαιτη may have had an iota adscript.
497. φησιν παραβλεψασα: παραβλέψασά φησι MSS., rightly.
499. τρεφε[ι]ν: φέρειν MSS. The remark of schol. V φησιν ὅτι διὰ σὲ φύουσιν αἱ Ἀθηναί ηδύσματα would apply to τρέφειν even better than to φέρειν, which connotes the idea of paying besides that of bearing.
505. The restoration gives 22 letters in the lacuna where the lines above and below have 18 or 19, so that Π probably did not have the correct spelling of the scholia ορθρο-: ὀρθο- R, &c., ὀρθοσ- V. Possibly δικο was omitted.
506. εχω: so V, &c., edd.; ἔχων R.
507. τυραννικα: so V Suidas and most edd.; τυραννίδα R, &c. There are no double dots at the end of this line or of l. 511.
508. ο]υδεν: οὐδ' ἄν MSS., rightly. The repetition of ἄν seems to have caused a difficulty, as in l. 510.
509. αποστ]ερης: l. αποστ]ερεις with the MSS.
510. η]διοπαν is an error for ηδιον αν: cf. note on l. 508.
511. πεπνυγμενον: so V, &c., edd.; πεπηγμένον R.
558. ας: ὄς V, &c., edd., ὡς R.
560. ει γ': εἴτ' MSS., rightly; cf. l. 795, note. Paragraphi are omitted before this line and l. 576.
564. αποκλοιον[τ]αι or αποκλοιον[.]τ[α]ι can be read; ἀποκλαίνονται RV, ἀποκλάονται BC, edd.
565. This verse is corrupt in the MSS., which have κακά (κακά γε B Ald.) πρὸς τοῖς (τοῖσιν B Ald.) οὔσιν ἕως ἂν ισώση (ἕως ἀνιῶν ἀνισώση V) τοῖσιν ἐμοῖσιν. Π is corrupt in having κακο for κακα and may have omitted ανων like RBC. Meineke proposed κακά πρὸς τοῖς οὔσι (κακοῖσι)ν ἕως ἂν ισ. τ. ἐμ., Starkie κα. π. τ. οὔσιν ἕως ἂν (δὴ τις) ισώση τ. ἐμ.
566. λεγουσι: so VBC; l. λέγουσιν with R.
568. αναπειθώμεθα: so VBC and most edd.; ἀναπειθόμεθα R.

570. *συ[γ]κηψαντ'* is for *συ[γ]κυψαντ'* (so RV and most edd.); *συγκυπτοντ'* BC Ald.
αποβληχ[αται]: so V; *ἄμα ἄμα βληχᾶται* R, *ἀμβληχᾶται* Bergk, *ἄμα βρυχᾶται* Van Leeuwen,
ἄμα βληχᾶται BC and most edd.
571. *θεον*: so RBC, edd.; *θεός* V.
573. *χοιρ[ιδι]οις*: so VBC, edd.; *χοιρίοις* R.
576. *γραφο[μαι]*: so Brunck; *γράφομαι* MSS. against the metre (V has the line in the margin).
577. Either *αχ[εις]* (BC, edd.) or *αχ[ρις]* (RV) may be restored. This line and l. 626 may be the last of the columns.
607. *μεν*: *ε* was written with a long middle stroke as if it were originally the last letter of the line, and *ν* seems to have been added by the first hand later. *με* MSS., rightly.
608. *προ]σκυψασα*: so RBC, edd.; *προσκύσασα* V. Richter's emendation *φιλή μ* for *φιλήση*, accepted by Van Leeuwen, is not confirmed.
609. *εκκαλαματα*: l. -*τα(ι)*. *Π* may have omitted *το* (added by Flor. Christianus) like the MSS.
612. *τοισι]ν*: so RB Ald.; *τούσι* C, *τούτοισιν* V, edd. It is not quite certain that *Π* had the unmetrical reading here, but 17 or 18 letters would be expected in the lacuna and *τουτοισι]ν* would require 20.
και μη με δεσησ: *καὶ μή με δεήση* (or *δεήση*) MSS., *κεὶ μή με δεήσει* Elmsley, Blaydes, *κοὺ μή με δεήση* H-G following Dobree.
613. *παραθησει*: so VBC, edd.; *παραθήση* with *ει* suprascr. R.
614. *αλλ' ην*: so Γ (*ἀλλ' ἦν*) edd.; *ἄλλην* RVBC. Meineke thought that there was a lacuna after this line, rejecting ll. 615-18.
- 619-20. *Π* agrees with RVΓ in combining these two lines into one, which is uniform with those preceding, and in omitting *της* before *του*. BC Ald., reading *τῆς τοῦ Διός*, make two lines corresponding to those following. For *Διους* l. *Διος*.
621. *απερ*: so VB Ald., edd.; *ᾧσπερ* R, *ὄσπερ* C.
623. *φησιν*: so R, correctly; *φησί* VBC.
624. *τ[ο δι]καστ[ηριο]ν*: so RVC, edd.; *τὰ δικαστήρια* B.
746. The *ο* of *ουκ* is above the *ο* of *σοις* in the next line, and it is not certain whether *Π* read *ᾶ* with RBC and edd. (om. V), but there is no room for *παρακελεύοντος* (B Ald.). The metre of this antistrophe is not at all clear. *ᾶ σου* does not correspond to *εἶναι* in l. 732, and cf. note on l. 749. Editors divide ll. 743-9 in several ways; *Π*'s arrangement agrees with that of RV.
749. [*πειθομ]ενος*: so MSS.; *πιθόμενος* most edd., following Brunck, who wished to make this verse correspond to l. 736 *σὺ δὲ παρῶν δέχου*. [*πειθομ]ενος* is too short for the lacuna, and the emendation of this chorus on metrical grounds is insecure; cf. l. 746, note.
τι βοας: so V and most edd.; *τί μοι βοᾶς* RBC.
752. *φησις*: *φησι* MSS., rightly, except R which has the unmetrical *φησιν*.
756. *σπενδ'*: so RBC, edd.; *σπενδ'* V.
790. *καπειτ] ενεθ[ηκε*: *κάπειτ' ἐπέθηκε* RBC Ald., Starkie; *κάπειθεν ἔθηκεν* V, *κάπειτ' ἐνέθηκε* Bergk, whose emendation may well have been confirmed, H-G.
795. *καθεψεις*: so H-G with the MSS.; *κατέψεις* Suidas, *καταπέψεις* Hirschig, *καταπέττεις* Van Leeuwen.
- γ' αργυριον*: *τάργυριον* MSS., Starkie, H-G, *ἀργύριον* Brunck. The article is unnecessary, but defensible as generic, and with *γούν* in the same line *γ'* is also superfluous; cf. *ει γ'* for *εἶτ'* in l. 560.
796. *οσ]ον . . . δητα*: so RBC, edd.; *ος ὄσον . . . om. δητα* V.
798. There is a blank space after *ν]ν*, but apparently no stop. Reiske wished to alter *ταῦθ'* to *πάνθ'*.

801. οἰ]κειασι : l. οἰ]κιασι.
 802. Either ενοι]κοδομησει (VBC) or ανοι]κοδομησει (R, &c.) can be restored. Editors alter to ενοικοδομησοι, following Dobree.
 806. [οσαπερ : so VΓ, H-G ; οσαπερ γ' (RBC) is less likely, for there are already 21 letters in the space which is filled by 20 in the line above and by 21 in the line below.
 808. ε]πι : so MSS. Some editors wish to read ἐκ or ἀπό, but cf. Starkie's note.
 816. [ινα γ η]ν : so MSS., Starkie, H-G ; [ιν η]ν (Cobet) is too short.
 825-6. V omits these two verses owing to homoioteleuton.
 865. The size of the lacuna suits λεξομεν (RBC, edd.) better than εξομεν (V).
 867. ξυ]νεβητο]ν : so MSS. ; ξυνεβήτην H-G with many editors, following Elmsley, but cf. Starkie's note.
 875. προθυ]ρο]υ : so RBC, edd. ; προυύλου V. π]ρο]υ]υλου would not suit the length of the lacuna. For the unmetrical προσπύλας of the MSS. Bentley proposed προπύλαιε.
 878. Below]μικας there is a blank space of three lines, ll. 879 sqq. being divided into short lines, as in RV.

1375. HERODOTUS vii.

15.5 x 12.3 cm.

Early second century.

The upper parts of two columns, written in carefully formed round uncials of medium size. Although smaller in scale there is a close resemblance between this hand and that of the well-known Bodleian Homer (cf. Kenyon, *Palaeogr.* Plate 20); it is also similar in style to 1362, though probably of a somewhat later date and more appropriately assigned to the second century than the first. A correction in Col. ii. 5 seems to be due to the original scribe, who may also be responsible for the punctuation by means of high dots in combination with paragraphi. A deep margin (7.5 cm.) was left at the top of the columns.

In the text of the papyrus the chief point of interest is its failure to confirm suggested editorial excisions. Two unsupported variants (i. 6-8, 10) are of no importance. This is the sixth Herodotus fragment from Oxyrhynchus; cf. H. G. Viljoen, *Herodoti fragmenta in papyris servata*.

Col. i.

μιλκαν Καρχη § 166
 δονιον εοντα >
 προς πατρος μη
 τροθεν δε Συρη
 5 κοσιον βασιλευ
 σαντα τε Καρχη
 [δ]ονιων κατ αν
 δραγ[α]θην ως η

Col. ii.

τοισι Ελ[λ]ησι εν § 167
 τη Σ[ι]κελ[ι]η[ι] εμα
 χοντο εξ ηο[υ]ς αρ
 ξαμενοι μεχ[ρι]
 λ
 5 δει[[τ]]ησ οψιη[σ] ε
 πι τοσουτο γαρ λε
 γετ[α]ι ελκυσαι [την

συμβολη τε εγει	[σ]υστασιν· ο δ Αμ[ιλ
10 νετο και ησσω	κας εν τουτωι [>
το τη μαχη α >	10 τωι χρονωι μ[ε
φανισθηται πυν	νων εν τωι [στρα
θανομαι· ουτε >	τοπεδωι εθυε[το
γαρ ζωντα ουτε α	και εκαλλιερε[ετο
15 [ποθανοντα	επι πυρης με[γα
.	15 [λης σ]ωματα ο[λα
.

i. 6-8. Καρχη[δ]ονιων κατ ανδραγ[α]θην : κατ' ανδραγ. Καρχ. MSS.

9. εγεινετο : S has εγένετο.

10. ησσωτο : ως έσσοῦτο MSS.

ii. 1. 2. εν τη Σικελίη is omitted by P*RSV and bracketed by Hude.

6. τοσουτο : τοσοῦτον RSV.

λε]γετ[α]ι : RSV have λέγειν. Cobet wished to omit the verb altogether.

12-13. The papyrus agrees with the MSS. in reading εθύετο και which was bracketed by Hude after Abicht.

1376. THUCYDIDES vii.

Height 31.8 cm.

Late second or early third
century. Plate III
(Col. iv, ll. 155-165).

These considerable portions of the last third of a roll containing the seventh book of Thucydides belong to the large find of classical texts which produced 841-4, 852-3, 1012, 1016-17, &c. The papyrus (Π) when discovered consisted of about 200 fragments, of which more than three-quarters have been identified. Excluding the small unplaced scraps, twenty columns, nearly all much damaged, are preserved, divided into three sections separated by gaps. The first, Cols. i-xiii, contains cc. 54-68. 2, after which there are six columns lost; the second section, Cols. xx-i, follows, containing 72. 1-73. 3; then comes another gap of six columns and finally the third section, Cols. xxviii-xxx1, containing 78. 5-82. 3, five or six columns more being required to finish the book. The hand is an elegant medium-sized uncial, resembling 1012 (Part VII, Plate iv) which was written between A. D. 205 and 250, and probably belongs to the early part of the third century or even the end of the second. The columns are tall, vii-viii having 53 lines, i, v, x, xi, xii, xiii 52, ii-iv, vi, ix 51, xxviii-xxx1 50, xxxii at least 49; xxi 48, xx 47. The lines are not very even and range from 15 to

23 letters, with an average of a little over 19. Their beginnings tend to slope away to the left as the columns proceed, giving the latter a considerable slant to the right. The common angular sign for filling up short lines is sparingly used, and final ν is occasionally represented by a horizontal stroke, at any rate in the later columns. Punctuation is indicated by high stops, marginal paragraphi, and sometimes by short blank spaces, but there are no breathings or accents, and diaereses are scarce. Iota adscript is rarely omitted in the first section, but frequently in the second and third. A few alterations have been made by the scribe himself (ll. 157 and 338), and corrections or alternative readings have been inserted here and there in two different hands, which are probably but little later than that of the main text (Π^2 ll. 356, 491, 551, 931, 956, 968; Π^3 407, 705). Uncorrected slips occur in l. 234 and perhaps in l. 638.

Π is in several respects the most important papyrus of Thucydides that has yet been found. While not possessing either the antiquity of the first-century fragments of Book iv (16 + 696) or the intrinsic merits of that unusually elaborate and careful copy, it is not only much the longest Thucydides papyrus extant but presents a good text, above the level of the average literary papyri of the same period, and moreover comes from a book in which the textual problems are exceptionally numerous and interesting. The seven chief MSS. form two groups, headed respectively by C, the tenth-century Laurentianus, and B, the eleventh-century Vaticanus. C is supported by G, the Monacensis (thirteenth century), which is sometimes defective, and B by A, the Cisalpinus (eleventh or twelfth century), E, the Palatinus, F, the Augustanus, and M, the Britannicus (all eleventh century), the last usually approximating to a middle position, although in the chapters covered by Π M exhibits more affinity to AEF than to CG. From vi. 92 to the end a disturbing element is introduced by the fact that B (supported up to vii. 50 by the fifteenth-century Parisinus 1734) branches off from the rest to such an extent that it is now generally supposed to represent a different recension, due to a sagacious but arbitrary grammarian, and Wilamowitz has proposed to identify this with an edition of Thucydides in thirteen books mentioned by Marcellinus. The ABEFM group was considered superior to CG by the older editors, who were imperfectly acquainted with C, but since the publication of Hude's text, which is based primarily on CG, the position has been reversed and the reputation of B has declined. As the divergences between B and C, particularly in vi. 92-viii, constitute the chief problem in the textual criticism of Thucydides, we preface a detailed classification of Π 's readings with a summary of the evidence of extant papyri, showing the number of their agreements with C against B and vice versa and of their new readings, but disregarding

minor points such as *ν ἐφελκυστικόν*, in the neglect of which Π resembles C. P. Giessen 12 is published by F. Fischer in *Thucyd. reliquiae in papyris et membranis Aeg. servatae*, Leipzig, 1913, pp. 27 sqq.; P. Wess. by C. Wessely in *Wiener Stud.* vii; the others are all from Oxyrhynchus, the small pieces 17, 451-3, and P. Geneva 257 being omitted.

1245	i. 139-41	4th cent.	with C	3	with B	0	new	5
853	extracts from ii. 1-45	late 2nd	"	3	"	7	"	12
878 ¹	ii. 22-5	late 1st	"	1	"	1	"	2
P. Giessen 12	ii. 59-60	4th or 5th	"	1	"	2	"	0
225	ii. 90-1	1st	"	3	"	0	"	1
879 ¹	iii. 58-9	3rd	"	1	"	1	"	0
16 + 696	iv. 28-41	1st	"	4	"	1	"	29
880 ¹	v. 32-4, 40, 96-8, 103-5, 111	late 2nd	"	2	"	0	"	10
1180	v. 60-3	3rd	"	0	"	0	"	5
1246	vii. 38	early 2nd	"	0	"	1	"	0
1247	viii. 8-11	2nd	"	2	"	4	"	4
P. Wess.	viii. 92	7th	"	5	"	3	"	8

The best text is given by 853, 225, 16 + 696, and 1247, several of the others having been carelessly written, while P. Giessen 12, 225, and 1246 are too short to show much of their real character. Of the four best the two first-century specimens tend to uphold C, the two second-century ones B, which in the parts covered by 853 is supported by AEFM, but not in those covered by 1247. The balance is on the whole slightly in favour of C before vi. 92, and in favour of B after that point. That the MSS. of Thucydides are in the main sound, but have deteriorated since the third century in a number of small points is indicated by some of the new readings, especially in 16 + 696.

The instances in which Π's readings affect differences between the seven principal MSS. are classified as follows, so as to bring into prominence its relations to C and B, whether alone or in combination with AEFM, which in this book are nearer to C than to B.

With C	against	ABEFGM	2	ll. 23, 45, right.
" C	"	ABEFM	1	66, wrong.
" CG	"	ABEFM	1	58, right.
" CE	"	ABFGM	1 (2?)	616?, 712, doubtful.
" ACF	"	BEGM	1	625, doubtful.
" CGM	"	ABEF	1	705, wrong, but corrected.

¹ 878. 47 *τωι τειχει* agrees with ABEFGM against C (*τῷ τε τείχει*), 879. 33 *δε* with ACEFGM against B (om.), and 880. 82 *σαφως* with ACEFGM against B (om.).

With C EFG	against ABM	I	444, right.
„ ACEFG	„ BM	I	144, doubtful.
„ ACEFM	„ B	I	157, right.
„ ACEFMB $\gamma\rho$.	„ B	I	725, doubtful.
„ ACEFGM	„ B	21 (22?)	9, 49, 64, 99, 125, 195, 447, 495, 552, 570, 683, 723, 734, 739, 852, 881, 943, 951, right; 122, 432?, 792, wrong; 186, doubtful.

With B against ACEFGM 20 (21?) 22, 133, 175, 190, 277, 430, 602-4, 611, 702, 909, 961, right; 14, 732-3, 948, wrong; 85, 150, 197, 562, 691, 911?, 956, doubtful.

With B (suprascr.) E	against ABCFM	I	ll. 94, right.
„ BG	„ ACEFM	I	406, wrong.
„ BEM	„ ACFG	I	699, right.
„ BFM	„ ACE	I	508, right.
„ ABEFM	„ CG	I	963, right.
„ ABEFM	„ C	2	162, 350, right.
„ ABEFGM	„ C	7	122, 234, 236, 633, 652, 959, right; 164, doubtful.
„ BCG	„ AEFM	I	720, right.
„ BCGM	„ AEF	I	442, right.
„ BCEGM	„ AF	2	235, 487, right.
„ BCEFM	„ AB $\gamma\rho$.	I	724, right.
„ ABCEFG	„ M	10	72-4, 121, 186, 496, 549, 720, 758, 782, 950, 967, right.
„ ABCFGM	„ E	3	72, 146-7, 487, right.
„ ABCEGM	„ F	I	91, right.
„ BCEFGM	„ A	I	405, right.
„ ABCEFM	„ G	4	77, 93, 149, 425, right.
„ EF	„ ABCGM	I	184, wrong.

From this table several conclusions follow. In the first place Π occupies a position almost exactly midway between B and C. Out of 69 passages in which these two MSS. are at variance Π agrees with C 32 (34?) times, with B 34 (35?) times in spite of the fact that in no less than 45 of these passages B stands alone, while C stands by itself only 12 times, being twice supported by G alone, and 55 times by one or more of AEFM. Where B is unsupported, Π agrees with it 20 (21?) times against 23 (24?) disagreements; where C is alone, it agrees with Π 3 times out of 12, and CG are supported by Π in 1 out of 2 instances. The text of B is therefore no longer isolated; it is practically as close to Π as is that

of C, its chief opponent, and closer to Π than are A or M. Out of the whole 94 passages in which the seven chief MSS. differ, Π agrees with E 58 (60?) times, B 57 (59?), F 57 (58?), C 56 (58?), and M 49 (50?), and with G 52 (53?) times out of 86 passages, so that the nearest MS. to Π is not a leader of either of the two families but E, and F is on the same level as B. E and F have very few distinctive readings: out of 6 cases in which E and 6 in which F differs from BC Π supports E twice (once with B *suprascr.*) and F once. Neither G nor A nor M obtains any assistance for their peculiar readings from Π, which agrees with BC against them 4, 6, and 11 times respectively.

From the point of view of quantity of agreements Π thus does not consistently support one MS. against the rest. C or CG when unsupported by some or all of AEFM are confirmed in less than a third of the instances. But nearly half of B's numerous peculiar readings in the chapters covered by Π are now shown to have been in existence in the second or third century, and the tendency of papyri, which was already traceable in 1246-7 and to a less extent in P. Wess. (cf. p. 157), to support B in vi. 92-viii was clearly no exceptional phenomenon. Since C and B are equidistant from Π, and there is no question of the text of C ever having been specially edited, it becomes doubtful whether that hypothesis is necessary in the case of B. An examination of the quality of the distinctive readings of B in relation to Π seems to us to favour the view that the special excellences and defects of B in the later books are due to its being derived, like C, from a text which is not far removed from that of Π, but into which a number of variations, chiefly errors, have been introduced in the intervening eight or nine centuries. Of the 19 (21?) readings in which B alone is supported by Π there are two clear cases of omission in ACEFGM owing to homoioteleuton (ll. 190 and 602-4); in ll. 22, 133, 175, 430, and 611 ACEFGM are clearly corrupt, while B's readings, which have been suspected of being due to an editor, are satisfactory, and in view of Π's confirmation can be accepted without demur; in l. 909 certainly and probably in l. 961 ACEFGM have made mistakes owing to ditto-graphy; in ll. 277 and 702 trifling additions are found in B, the omission of which may well be explained as slips. In all these 11 cases ΠB are certainly or probably right against the other MSS. The instances in which ΠB's reading is probably wrong confine themselves to two apparent examples of the confusion of ἦδη with δῆ (ll. 14 and 948; cf. l. 19, where Π is right and all the MSS. wrong on this point), and πεπανμένους for ἀναπεπανμένους in ll. 732-3. The remaining 7 cases, about which there is some doubt whether, as in the editions of Hude and Stuart Jones, they should be rejected or, as we should in the light of the new evidence prefer, be accepted, are small omissions or insertions (l. 85 om. δῆ, 150 ἐπέφερον for ἔφερον, 691 om. εἰσί, 911 add. τῆς?) or

slight changes in the order of words (ll. 197 and 562), and *σωτήριον* as a v.l. for *σωτηρίαν* (l. 956). In any case they postulate only a trifling error on the part of either ΠB or, as is, we think, more likely, of ACEFGM. That the latter group combines to make some very serious mistakes is quite clear from their omissions owing to homoioteleuton, where B is proved by Π to have preserved the right text. C, when alone, contributes hardly anything of value in the chapters covered by Π; for in l. 45 *κωλύσουσι* for *κωλύσῳσι* after *ὅπως*, though probably right, is trivial, the omissions of *ὑπό* in l. 66, *καί* in 122 and 350, and *ἡσυχάζοντων* in 236, the insertions of *οἱ* in 164 and 234, the substitution of *καταργόμενοι* for *κατειργόμενοι* in 162, *ἐσόμεναι* for *ἔσονται* in 633, *ἀταξία* for *ἀταξίαν* in 652, and *ἀναγκάζονται* for *ἀναγκάζονται* in 959 are, for the most part at least, obvious slips. Lines 22–3 afford a good illustration of the nature of corruptions which have arisen in Thucydides' MSS. between the third and tenth century. C has there *ναυσὶ καὶ ἵπποις καὶ μεγέθει ἐχούσαις*, B *ναῦς καὶ ἵππους καὶ μεγέθει ἐχούσαις*, AEFM *ναυσὶ καὶ ἵπποις καὶ μεγέθει ἐχούσαις*. The emendation of Duker *ἰσχυούσαις* for *ἐχούσαις* would account for the datives, but Π, which apparently had *ναῦς καὶ ἵππους καὶ μεγέθει ἐχούσαις*, is probably correct in spite of the simplicity of this reading, and the datives are to be regarded as errors which are less advanced in B and C than in the other MSS.

On the other hand, while the frequent and judicious support lent to B is one of the chief features of Π and cannot fail to increase the respect due to that MS. in vi. 92–viii, the superiority of Π's text to that of B, as to that of any other MS. of Thucydides, is shown by its slightly more frequent and not less judicious agreements with ACEFGM against B. Out of 23 (24?) of these (G is defective in a few cases) there are only two cases (122 *Τήνιοι* for *Τήιοι* and 792 *ἐκατέρωθεν* for *ἐκάτεροι*), and possibly a third (432 *ᾤπερ δὴ* for *ᾤπερ*), in which there are strong reasons for considering B superior to ΠACEFGM. In 725 (*διαλαβόντας* for *προφθάσαντας*) Π's support of the ordinary reading is confirmed by the removal of the repetition of *προφθάνειν* in 751 (*φθάσῳσι* Π). The omission of *γάρ*, which is inserted by B in 186, is quite defensible, and the changes in the order effected by B in 83–4, 125, and 552 have nothing special to recommend them. The following readings of B, 49 om. *τά*, 99 *ἕκαστοι* for *ἐκάστοις*, 195 *λειπομένους* for *ἀεὶ πολεμίους*, 683 *ἐβούλοντο* for *ἐβουλεύοντο*, 723 *τά* for *τάς*, 739 *τετάφθαι* for *τετράφθαι*, 852 *τρεψόμεναι* for *τρεψάμενοι*, 881 om. *μέρος*, 943 *τε* for *τότε*, are merely due to slips of a copyist and are naturally absent from Π, while the rest of B's peculiar readings, 9 om. *καί*, 157 *δέ* (rejected by Π) for *τε*, 447 *ἐσομένης* for *οὔσης*, 495 om. *καί*, 570 *ἔπειτα δέ* for *ἔπειτα*, 734 *Ἡράκλεια* for *αὐτοῖς Ἡρακλεῖ*, 951 *ἐκατὸν καί* for *καί*, though requiring consideration as probably ancient variants, have not found favour with recent editors, whose judgement in selecting from B's variants

is generally confirmed by Π's evidence, as also in the less numerous cases where AEFGM are divided between B and C. Of these instances ΠCG are undoubtedly right against ABEFM in l. 58 (φόβου against φόβωι, a copyist's error), and PCEFG against ABM in 444 (φαίνεται against φαίνηται which is due to a confusion of *ἐάν* with *ἐάν*). That Π is also right in supporting ACEFG against BM in l. 144 (κατὰ ἔχθος, omitting τό), CE against ABFGM in 616 (om. καί) and 712 (ἀποχωρήσασα against ὑποχωρήσασα) is more questionable, but still, as we think, probable; in an apparent but not quite certain agreement with ACF against BEGM in 625 either reading may be correct. On the other hand Π naturally supports B (suprascr.) E in 94 ξυνδιασώσοντες (ξυνδιασώσαντες ABCFM by a slip), BEM in 699 αὐτῶν (αὐτόν ACFG, also a slip), ABEF in 705 ἀναχωρήσοντες (ἀναχωρήσαντες CGM, a dittography from the following ξύμπαντες, also found in Π but corrected by Π²), and ABEFM in 963 αὐτῷ πρώτῳ (om. πρώτῳ CG). The agreement with BFM against CE in 508 as to the form πλευσομένων against πλευσουμένων is trivial, and Π has made the same mistake as BG in 406-7 παρεσκευάζεσθε for παρασκευάζεσθε, the origin of the error (παρασκευαζεσθαι wrongly corrected to -θε) being established. The 24 cases (cf. p. 158) where BC combine against one or more of the other MSS. need not be discussed in detail, since Π uniformly supports BC save in the unimportant matter of the spelling of στρατεία (l. 184), for which ΠEF have στρατιά (cf. l. 17 referred to below, where Π alone is correct on this point). With a few exceptions (e.g. the reading of M in 720) the variations of the other MSS. from BC are mainly mere mistakes, and even where they are defensible the authority of Π coincides with the verdict already expressed by recent editors against them.

Another interesting feature of Π is its occasional agreement with the later MSS. against the seven leading codices selected by Hude, who almost entirely disregards the later ones except Parisinus 1734 in vi. 92-vii. 50. The phenomenon of agreements between papyri and the 'deteriores' is not new; it has been decidedly marked e. g. in the case of Xenophon, as is shown by 463 and 697, but in that of Thucydides the only instances hitherto have been 16. ii. 36 διέδοσαν with Bekker's KN for διεδίδοσαν and 853. v. 21 ἐκφυγεῖν with Paris. 1735 for ἐκφεύγειν. Π, however, exhibits at least 7 (8?) coincidences with the late MSS. One of these, 747 οὐκ for οὐκέτι with apparently KN and Paris. 1734 and 1791, is almost certainly right (Hude brackets ἐτι with Krüger), and the insertion of οἱ before Συρακόσιοι in 999 with N, though perhaps due to a misplacement (cf. note *ad loc.*), is in accordance with custom. In ll. 486-7, where the chief MSS. are corrupt and Π is unfortunately incomplete, it apparently agrees with Paris. 1637, 1638, and 1736 in omitting an *ἄν* which can hardly be right, though whether that omission alone is sufficient to restore the passage is somewhat doubtful. In

544 Bekker's KLNOPQ and Paris. 1637, 1638, 1733, 1734, and 1736 are stated to read ἐπιβουλή (with Π) instead of ἐπιβολή before τῶν σιδηρῶν χειρῶν, and this reading of the later MSS. deserves consideration although rejected by recent editors. Against the conclusiveness of the parallel χειρῶν σιδηρῶν ἐπιβολαί in l. 434 may be urged first the possibility that ἐπιβολή in the second passage is a reminiscence of the first, and secondly the employment of the singular not the plural. In any case ἐπιβουλή is to be regarded not as an error of the late MSS. but an ancient reading. In 713 Π agrees with Paris. 1637 in having πον for ποι in καθεζομένη ποι τῆς Σικελίας, a variant which is defensible. The omission, however, of Βοιωτοί before Βοιωτοῖς in 142, which also occurs in Paris. 1636, is probably a mistake; cf. the insertion of Δωριῆς in 152. Nor is there anything to be said in favour of ἀντιλαβεῖν, which was erroneously read by Π¹ with Bekker's H in 551, but for which Π² rightly wished to substitute the ordinary reading ἀντιλαβήν. ἐνεκκυκλῶντο for the usual ἐκυκλῶντο in 946, which is partly supported by ἐνεκκυκλῶντο in Paris. 317, lacks parallels earlier than the Roman period, while the simple verb is common in Thucydides and occurs again as near as l. 969; but for this very reason the compound may after all be right; cf. ll. 63 and 150. The agreements between Π and the late MSS., though not very striking and in a few instances, e.g. 551, probably due to accident, show that something may yet be gleaned from further collations of the MSS. of Thucydides.

The new readings peculiar to Π, apart from a few mere mistakes which have been corrected, number twenty-six. They are thus less frequent than those in the much shorter first-century fragments of Book iv, which would cover about 250 lines of Π, and in the extracts from Book ii in 853, which was found with Π and is contemporary with it; cf. p. 157. The following eight seem to be improvements, four of them confirming conjectures: 17 στρατείας for στρατιᾶς (so Aem. Portus); 19 δῆ for ἤδη (so Gertz); 80 (?) om. τε (so Hude); 549 (?) om. ἄν (so Herwerden); 660-1 δικαίως ἴωσι for δικαίωσσι; 691 om. ἔτι; 751 φθάσσι for προφθάσσι; 999 add οἱ before Συρακόσιοι. On the other hand the following seven are of more doubtful value: 4 τῶι πεζῶι for τῶν πεζῶν, 10 om. μέν, 19 ὁμοτρόποις for ὁμοιοτρόποις, 63 ἀνευγκεῖν for ἐνεγκεῖν, 67 add ἐπί, 152 Δωριῆς Δωριεῦσι for Δωριεῦσι, 732 τε ναυμαχίας for ναυμαχίας τε. In 86, 133, 352, 634, and 680 words certainly or probably occurred in Π which are not in the MSS., but owing to lacunae the nature of the additions is uncertain. In 638 there was some variant for πεπύσθαι, which however seems to have been the word intended. The insertion of καὶ ὡς in 363 and the omission of τε in 931 and of οἱ in 999 appear to be mistaken, and δὲ πολεμίοις for δ' ἐναντίοις in 695 and the insertion of ἄ in 729 are probably errors of repetition. The new readings are thus not very numerous, nor, except in 661, do they make very much difference, and passages in the

MSS. which have been widely suspected are generally confirmed; cf. notes on ll. 22-3, 81, 94-5, 110, 139, 175, 483, 664, and 992. The larger proportion of new readings in 853 and much larger one in 16 + 696 may well be due to the different character of B in Book vii and in the earlier books, where it usually combines with AEFM. If B had maintained its normal relation to the other members of its family, Π would have presented far more novelties. The fact that nearly half of B's peculiar readings, including almost all those which are probably right, occur in Π proves their antiquity and value, and from vi. 92-viii B's authority is now entitled to rank at least as high as that of C. With regard to the earlier books of Thucydides the evidence of papyri has hitherto been conflicting, but on the whole tends to support CG against ABEFM (cf. p. 157); 853, however, in a majority of cases favours the other side, the commentator in one case remarking of a variant found in CEG *ἐν ἐνίοις δὲ γράφεται*. Π's support of B in the later books hardly affects the question, since the change which comes over B at vi. 92, however it is to be explained, clearly indicates another source for its text of the later books. That B in them represents an edition by a grammarian seems to us, as has been said, unlikely. In view of the notable agreements between B and Π the date of such a revision would have to be placed not later than the second century; for after deducting from the total of B's peculiar readings (45) the instances (20 or 21) in which it simply supports Π, and those in which its reading can be readily explained by the ordinary processes of manuscript corruption, the remainder is small (about 12; cf. p. 158). This residue seems more likely to be due partly to the varied and independent character of its ancestor, which often agreed with Π but had many points of divergence, partly to the normal entrance of variations between the third and eleventh century, than to conjectures, whether good or bad, of a grammarian. It is indeed possible, and even probable, that if the text of Books ii and iv corresponding to B's version of vi. 92-viii could be recovered, it would prove to contain many of the new readings of 853 and 16 + 696, and 853 happens to represent the text used by a grammarian who flourished at some period between 10 B. C. and A. D. 130 and may have played a part in determining the future text of Thucydides. But to the view that in vi. 92-viii CG or ACEFGM represent the main tradition current in the second century, and ΠB stand apart as being due to a separate edition, several objections may be urged. The papyrus texts of Plato, Xenophon, Isocrates, and Demosthenes have, as a rule, been distinctly eclectic in their relations to the mediaeval MSS., and the eclectic character of Π's text, which stands about midway between B and C, is a strong argument for its normality. Π neither exhibits a large number of arbitrary variants nor manifests any desire to eliminate

difficulties of construction, being on the whole decidedly conservative and combining the good points of both B and C, while 1246-7, so far as they go, display the same tendency to agree with many of B's peculiar readings. Probably, therefore, B in vi. 92-viii represents a line of manuscript tradition which is different from that of ACEFGM, but to an equal extent conforms to the papyrus texts. B's variations from C in both the earlier books, as is indicated by 853, and in the later, as is shown by Π, are to a large extent as old as at least the first or second century. Beyond the first century the history of the text of Thucydides is as yet veiled in obscurity.

Col. i.	Col. ii.
[ο]θεν και τους [ι]ππους ε[λ]α 54	κατ[α θ]αλασσα[ν] καλον [56. 2
[β]ον· Αθηναιοι δε ης [τε	[σφ]ι[σ]ι ε[ς τους Ελλη]η[να]ς το [
[ο]ι Τυρρηνοι τ[ρ]οπης ε[ποι	55 α[γων]ι[σ]μα φανε[ι]σθ[αι] τους
[ησα]ντο τ[ω]ι πεζ[ω]ι ες την	τε [γ]αρ α[λλους] Ελλη[να]ς ευ
5 [λι]μ[ν]ην κα[ι] η[ς] αυτοι τ[ω]ι	θυ[ς] τους μεν ελευθερουσθαι
[αλλ]ωι σ[τρ]ατ[ο]πεδωι γε 55. 1	τους δε φοβ[ο]υ απο[λυε]σθ[αι]
[γεν]ημενη[ς] δε[] της νι [ου γαρ ετι δυ[ν]α[την] εσ[ε]σθαι [
[κης] τοις Σ[υρ]ακ[ο]σιοις >	60 την υπολοιπ[ο]ν Αθη[ναι]
[λα]μ[π]ρα[ς] ηδη και του ν[αυ]	ων δυναμιν τ[ο]ν υσ[τερ]ο[ν] [ε
10 [τικου] προτερον γαρ εφ[ο]	[π]ενεχθησομ[ε]νο[ν] πολε
[βουντο] τα[ς] μετα του Δη []	μ[ο]ν ανενεγκειν· [και αυ
[μοσθενους] ναυς επελ[θου	τοι δοξαντες αυτ[ων] αιτι
[σας] ο[ι] [μεν] Αθηναιοι εν []	65 [ο]ι ε[ι]ναι υπο τε των [αλλων]
[πα]ν[τι] ηδη α[θυμι]α[ς] ησαν	ανθρωπων κα[ι] των επει
15 [και] ο παρα[λογος] α[ντ]οις με	τα επι πολ[λ]υ θαυμ[ασθη]σε
[γας] ην [π]ολυ δ[ε] μ[ειζων] ετι	σθαι· και ην [δ]ε αξ[ι]ος ο αγω̄ 3
[της] στρ[ατ]ειας [ο] μεταμε	κατα τ[ε] ταυ[τα] και οτι
[λος] πολε[σι] γ[α]ρ [ταυ]τα[ις] μο 2	70 [ουχι] Αθηνα[ιων] μονον
[ναις] δη ομ[οτ]ρο[πο]ι[ς] επελ []	[περι]εγιγνοντο [αλλα και
20 [θοντ]εσ δημ[οκρατο]υμε	τ[ων] αλλων πολλ[ων] ξυμμα
[ναις] τε ωσπερ και [αυ]τοι και	χ[ων] και ο[υ]δε α[υ]τοι αυ μο
[ναυς και] ιπ[π]ους και [μ]εγε	νο[ν] αλλα και μετα των ξυ
[θη] εχ[ο]υ[σαι] ου δυ[ναμ]ε	75 μβ[ρο]θησαντων σφισιν
[νοι] επεν[ε]γκειν [ουτ] εκ πο	η[γ]εμονες τε γενομενοι με
25 [λιτεια]ς τ[ι] μεταβολης το	τα Κορι[νθιων] και Λακε

	[διαφορον αυ]τ[οις ωι προση 15 lines lost.		δαι[μο]νιων [και την σφε τεραν [πολιν εμπαρασχον	
42	[του αυτοι σωθηναι μονο]ν [ετι την επιμελειαν] ε [ποιουντο αλλα και οπω]ς	56. 2	80 [τες] προκι[ν]δυν[ευσαι και [τ]ου ναυτικου μ[εγα μερος [προ]κοψαντες ε[θνη γαρ	4
45	[εκεινους κωλυσο]υ[σι νο] [μιζοντες ο]π[ερ ην α]πο [τε των παροντ]ων [π]ο [λυ σφων κ]αθ[υπερτερ]α [τα πραγματα ε]ι[ν]α[ι] και		[πλην γε το]ν ξ[υ]μ[παντος [. εν] τω[δε τωι [πολεμωι προς την] Αθ[η]ναι [ων τε πολιν και Δ]ακεδ[αι [μονιων τοσοιδε] γαρ εκα	57. 1
50	[ει δυναιντο κρα]τησαι Α [θηναιων τε και τω]ν ξυμ [μαχων και κατ]α γην κα[ι]		90 [τεροι επι Σικελιαν] τ[ε και [περι Σικε]λια[ς το]ι[ς μεν [ξυγκτη]σομενοι [την [χωραν ε]λθ[οντες τοις δε [ξυνδι]ασω[σ]οντ[ες επι Συρα	
			95 [κουσ]α[ς ε]π[ολε]μησαν [ου κατ]α δικην τι [μαλλον [ουδε] κατα ξυ[γ]γε[ν]ει[α]ν [μετ] αλλ[ηλων] [σ]τα[ντες [αλλ]ω[ς [εκαστ]οις τη[ς ξυν	
			100 [τυ]χ[ι]α[ς η κατα] το ξυμφε [ρον] η α[ναγκη εσχεν Αθη	2
			[ναιο]ι [μεν αυτοι Ιωνες επι Δω[ριεας Συρακοσιους	

Col. iii.

Col. iv. Plate III.

	[εκοντες ηλθο]ν κα[ι α]υ[τοις	57. 2	155 [Συρακοσι]ων στρατευο[μ]ε	57. 6
105	[τηι αυτηι φω]νηι [και νομι [μοις ετι χρω]μενο[ι] Αημνιοι [και Ιμβ]ριοι [κ]αι Αιγιν[ηται [οι τοτ]ε Αιγι[ν]αν [ε]ιχ[ον και [ετι Εστι]αιης οι εν Ε[υβοι		[νοις ην]αγκαζοντο πολε [μειν] των ^τ [[δ]]ε περι Πελο [ποννησ]ον νησιωτων [Κεφαλλην]ες μεν και	7

- 110 [αι] Εσ[τιαι]αν· οικου[ν]τ[ε]ς α
 [π]οικ[οι] οντες ξυ[ν]ε[στ]ρα
 [τευσαν των] δε α[λλων] [οι] 3
 [μεν υπηκοοι οι] δ α[π]ο ξ[υ]μ
 [μαχιας αυτονομ]ο[ι] εισι
 6 lines lost.
- 121 α[πο] δε [νησων Κειοι και Αν] 4
 [δ]ροι[οι] και [Τ]η[οι] εκ δ Ιωνιας
 Μι[λη]σι[οι] και [Σ]α[μιοι] και Χι
 οι· τ[ου]των Χιοι ου[χ] υποτε
- 125 λεις οντες φο[ρου] ναυς δε
 παρεχοντες α[υτο]νομοι
 ξυνεσπ[ον]το και το πλει
 [σ]τον Ιωνες ο[ν]τες ουτοι
 [π]αν[τ]ες και α[π] Αθηναιων
- 130 [πλ]ην Καρυστιω[ν]· ου[τ]ο[ι]
 [δ] ει[σι]ν Δρυοπε[ς] υπηκ[οοι]
 [δ] ο[ν]τ[ε]ς και αυ[α]γκη ομωσ
 [.]ες γε επι Δωρια[ς]
 [η]κολουθουν· προς δ αυ[τ]οις
- 135 [Αι]ολησ Μηθυμναιοι μεν
 [να]υσι και ου φο[ρ]ω υπηκο
 ο[ι] Τ[ε]νεδιοι δε και Αινιο[ι] ν
 ποτελεις· ουτοι δε Αιολη[ς]
 Αιολευσι τοις κτισασι Βοι[ω]
- 140 τοις μετα Συρακοσιων [κ]ατ[α]
 αναγκην εμαχον[τ]ο >
 Πλαταιησ δε[ε] κατ[α]ντικρυ
 Βοιωτοις μονοι ει[κ]οτωσ
 κατα εχθος· Ροδ[ιο]ι δε και > 6
- 145 Κυθη[ρι]οι Δωριη[ς] αμφοτε
 ροι οι μεν Λακεδαιμονι >
 ων απ[ο]ικ[ο]ι [Κυ]θηριοι επι
 Α[α]κ[ε]δ[αι]μονιους τ[ο]υς α
 [μα] Γυλιππ[ω]ι με[τ] Αθηναι
- 160 [Ζακυνθιοι] αυτονομοι >
 [μεν κατα δε] το νησιω
 [τικον μαλλον] κατειργ[ο]
 [μενοι οτι θαλα]σ[σ]ησ ε [
 [κρατουν οι Αθη]ναιοι ξ[υ]ν
 165 [ειποντο Κερκυ]ραι[οι] δε
 7 lines lost.
- 173 [θος το Κορι]νθ[ιων] ουχ ησ
 [σον ειπο]ντο· και οι Με[σ]σ[η] 8
 175 [νιοι νυν] κα[λ]ο[υ]με[νοι] εκ
 [Ναυπακτο]υ και εκ Π[υ]λου τ[ο]
 τ[ε] υπ Αθη[να]ιω[ν] εχομε [
 νη[ς] εσ το]ν πο[λε]μον πα[ρε]
 λη[φθησ]α[ν]· [και ε]τι Μ[ε]γα
 180 [ρ]εφ[ν] φυγαδες ου] πολλοι
 [Μεγαρε]υσ[ι] Σ[ελινου]ντιοις
 [ουσι κατ]α ξ[υ]μ[φο]ραν εμ[α]
 χοντ[ο] των δε[ε] α[λλων] [ε] 9
 κουσ[ιο]ς μαλ[λον] η στ[ρα] [
 5 185 τια [εγ]ιγνετο [ηδ]η Α[ρ]
 [γε]ιοι [μεν ου] τ[η]ς [ξ]υ[μ]μαχ[ι]
 [ας ενεκα μαλλον η] τ[η]ς [
 [Λακεδαιμονιων [. . .]] τε [
 [εχθρας και τ]η[ς] παραυτι [
 190 [κα εκαστοι ιδ]ιασ ωφελι [
 [ας Δωριησ επ]ι Δωριασ [
 [με]τα Α[θη]ναιων Ιωνω[ν]
 η[κολουθουν] Μαντινησ
 δε[ε] και αλλοι] Αρκα[δ]ων
 195 μ[ισθο]φ[ο]ροι επι] τους αι
 [πολε]μιου[ς] σφισιν] αποδει
 κνυμ[ε]ν[ους] ειωθ[ο]τε[ς] ι[ε]
 ναι και [τοτε τους μετ]α
 [Κ]ορινθιω[ν] ελθοντας Αρ
 200 καδας [ο]υ[δ]εν [ησσον] δια

150 ων οπλα επεφερον· Ροδι
 οι δε Αργ[ει]οι γενος [Σ]υρα
 κοσι[οις με]ν Δωριης Δωρι
 [ε]υσι Γελωιο[ις] δε κα[ι] αποι
 [κοις εαυτ]ων ουσι με[ε]τα

κερδ[ο]ς ηγ[ο]ν[μενοι] πολε
 [μ]ιο[υς]· Κρητ[ες] δε και Αι
 3 lines lost.

Col. v.

17 lines lost.

223 [ταναιοι βαρβαρων δε] Εγε [57. 11
 [σταιοι οιπερ επηγα]γον []
 225 [το και Σικελων το πλεον]
 [και των εξω Σικελια]ς Τ[υ
 [ρρηνων τε τιν]ες κατα [δι
 [αφοραν Συρακοσι]ων κα[ι] Ι
 [απυγες μισθοφορο]ν τοσα []
 230 [δε μεν μετα Αθ]ηναιων
 [εθνη εστρατευο]ν Συρα 58. 1
 [κοσιοις δε αντε]βοηθη
 [σαν Κ]αμ[α]ρι[ναι]οι μεν ομο
 [ροι ον]τες κα Γε[λωιο]ι ο[ικ]ο[υ]ν
 235 [τες] μετ [αυ]τους [επειτ Ακρα
 [γα]ντι[ν]ων ησυχ[αζοντων
 [εν τω]ι [ε]π [ε]κειν[α ιδρυμε
 [νοι Σ]ελι[ου]ντιοι και οιδε
 [με]ν της [Σικελιας] το
 18 lines lost.

Col. vi.

9 lines lost.

267 [αποσταλε]ντες [και Σικυ 58. 3
 [ωνιοι ανα]γκασ[τοι στρα
 [τευοντες] κα[ι] τ[ων εξω] Πε
 7 lines lost.
 277 [ες και ιππο]ι και ο [αλλος 4

Col. vii.

309 [οι τολ]μησω[σι] πα[ρεσκευ 59. 3
 310 α[ζοντ]ο κα[ι] ολ[ιγον ουδεν
 [ς ουδεν] επεν[οουν τοις] δε 60. 1
 [Αθηναιο]ς τηγ [τε αποκλη
 σι]ν ορωσι κ[α]ι τηγ αλληγ
 [δ]ι[ανοια]ν αυτ[ων αισθο
 8 lines lost.
 323 [εκπλε]ν[σομενοι απειπον 2
 [μη επα]γε[ιν ουτε το λοι
 325 [πον εμ]ελλον [εξειν ει μη
 [ναυκρα]τησου[σιν εβου
 [λευσαντο τα μεν τειχη τα α]
 [νω εκλιπ]ε[ιν προς δ αυταις
 [ταις ναυσι]ν α[πολαβοντες
 330 [διατειχι]σμα[τι οσον οιον τ ε
 [λαχιστον] τοις τε σκευεσι]
 [και τοις ασθενεσι] ικανον]
 [γενεσθαι του]τ[ο μεν φρου
 [ρειν απο δε του] αλ[λ]ου πεζου
 335 [τας ναυς] πα[σα]ς ρ[αι ησαν
 [και δυνατ]αι κα[ι] α[πλωτε
 [ραι παν]τα τινα ε[σβιβαζον
 [τες [[ην μεν]]] κ[αι διαναι
 [μαχησαντες] ην μεν νικω
 5 lines lost.
 345 [ρικου η] Ελληγ[ικου φιλιου
 [αντι]ληψεσθαι κα[ι οι μεν 3

[ομιλος α]φθονο[s ξυνελε
[γη και προ]s [α]παρ[τας αυ
29 lines lost.

[ως εδοξ]ε αυ[το]ις ταυ[τ]α και
[εποι]ησαν εκ τε γ[αρ τ]ων α
[νω τ]ειχων υποκ[α]τεβη

350 [σαν κ]αι τας ναυς επ[λη]ρω
[σαν π]ασας αναγκασ[αν]τ[ε]s
[. . .]as ε[σ]βαινειν [οσ]τιs
[και οπ]ω[σ]ουν εδοκει ηλι [

355 [δειος ει]ν[αι] και ξυνεπλη 4
[ρωθησα]ν νηes αι πασ[αι] δε
[κα μαλι]στα και εκατ[ο]ν· [

360 [τε Ακαρνανω]ν κ[αι των α
[λλων ξενων εσεβιβαζον]

Col. viii.

και τα αλλα ω[s οιον τ ην 60. 4
και ως εξ αναγκ[αιου τε και
τοι[αυτη]s διαν[οιαs επο
365 [ρισαντο]· ο δε Ν[ικιαs επει 5
21 (?) lines lost.
387 [σαν που οικειαν π]ολ[ιν επι 61. 1
[δειν αθυμειν δε] ο[υ] χρη ου 2
[δε πασχειν οπερ] οι α[πειρο
390 [τατοι των ανθρωπων οι τοιs]
[πρωτοιs αγωσι σφ]αλ[εν
[τες επειτα δια] παντος [την
[ελπιδα του φο]βου ομ[οιαν
[ταιs ξυμφοραιs εχο]υσιν [α 3
395 [λλ οσοι τε Αθηναιων] παρ[ε
[στε πολλων ηδη πολ]ε[μων
[εμπειροι οντες και οσοι]
[των ξυμμαχων ξυ]στ[ρα

Col. ix.

4 lines lost.

419 [πολ]λ[οι και ακοντισται 62. 2
420 [επιβ]η[σουνται και οχλος ωι
[ναυμαχιαν μεν ποιο]υμ[ε
[ν]οι εν π[ε]λαγει ουκ] αν [ε
χ[ρω]μ[ε]θ[α δια] το βλαπτ[ειν
αν το] της επιστημη[s
425 τη[ι] β[α]ρυτητι των νε[ω]ν [

εν δε τη ενθαδε] ηναγ [

3 430 [π]εξομα[χιαι] προ[σφορα
εσται· ευρηται δ ημ[ιν] οσα
3 χρη αντ[ινα]υπηγη[σαι και
[π]ρο[s τας τ]ω[ν] επω[τ]ι[δ]α[ν
[α]υτ[ο]ι[s πα]χ[υτη]α[s] ωπερ
[μαλιστ]α [εβλ]απ[τ]ομεθ]α
χ[ειρων σι]δη[ρων επιβολαι

- [τευομενο]ι αιει μνησθη
 400 [τε των εν τοις] πολεμοις παρα [λογων και το τ]ης τυχης καν [μεθ ημων ελπισα]ν[τ]ες
 [στηναι και ως ανα]μαχου
 [μενοι αξι]ως τουδε του πλη
 405 [θους οσο]ν [αυτοι] υμων αυ
 [των ε]φορ[ατε] παρεσκευα
] ε[] α [δε εν]ειδο
 [ξεσθ]αι τ[ι]ο[. αρωγ]α οιμεν 62. 1
 [επι]τη [του λιμε]νος [σ]τε
 [νοτ]ητ[ι] προς τον μ[ελλ]ο[ν]
 410 [τα ο]χλ[ον των νεων εσ]ε
 [σθ]αι [και προς την εκει
 [νω]ν [επι των καταστρω
 [ματ]ω[ν] παρασκευην οισ
 [προτερον εβλαπτομεθα]
- 435 α[ι σχησου]σι την παλιν α
 ν[ακρουσι]ν της προ[σ]πεσου [σης [νεωσ] ην τα επι το[υ]τοι[s]οι [επιβαται] υπουργωσι εσ 4
 το[υ]το γαρ δη ηναγκασ[με]
 440 θ[α] [ωστ]ε [πεξ]ομα[χ]ειν απο
 τ[ων νεων και το μητε
 [αυ]του[s] ανα[κρο]υεσθαι μη ε
 κειν[ους] εα[ν] ωφελιμον
 φαινετα[ι] α[λλωσ] τε και της
 445 [γ]ης πλ[η]ν ο[σον αν ο] πεξο[s]
 [ημ]ων [επ]εχ[ηι] πολ[εμιασ]
 [ουσης] ων χ[ρη] με 63. 1
 [μνημενο]υσ διαμαχε
 [σθαι οσον αν] δυ[νησ]θε
 450 [κ]αι μ[η εξωθει]σθα[ι] εσ αυτ[η]ν
 αλλ[α ξυμπε]σ[ο]υση[s] ν[ηι]
 [νεωσ μη προ]τερο[ν] αξι
 [ουν απολυεσθαι η] το[υ]s α
 12 lines lost

Col. x.

8 lines lost.

- 474 [μ]η [οντες υμων της τε 63. 3
 475 φ[ω]νη[s] τ[ηι] επιστημη
 και τω[ν] τροπων τη μι
 μη[σ]ε[ι] ε[ι]θα[υμαξεσθε]
 [κ]ατα [την] Ελλαδα και της αρ
 χ[ησ] της ημετερας ουκ ε
 480 λασ[σον] κατα το ωφελει
 σθαι εσ [τε το φοβερον τοις
 υπηκο[οις] και το αδικει
 σθαι [πολυ πλεον μετειχε
 τε ωστ]ε κοινωνοι μονοι 4
 485 ελευ[θερωσ] ημιν της αρ
- Col. xi.
 5 lines lost.
- 523 [υμων νυν εσομενοι] και π[ε] 64. 2
 [ξοι τοις Αθηναιοις] εισι και
 525 [νηες και υπολοιπος] πολις [
 10 lines lost.
 536 σα[μενος ευθυς] εκελευε 65. 1
 πλ[η]ρουν τας ναυς τωι
 δε [Γυλιππωι και τοις Συρα
 κοσι]οις παρην μεν αισθα
 540 νεσ[θαι] ορωσι και αυτην
 την π[αρασκευην] οτι ναυ
 μαχησ[ουσιν] οι Αθηναιοι
 προ[η]γγ[ε]λθη δ αυτοις και

χης ου[τες] δι[κ]αιως αυ
 την νυν μ[η] καταπρο]δι
 [δ]οτ[ε κ]ατα[φρονησαντ]ες
 δε Κοριν[θιων τε ους] πολ
 490 [λ]ακ[ι]ς νενικ[ηκατε κ]αι [Σικ]ε
 ων
 [λιωτ]ων [ουδ αντιστη]ναι
 [ουδεις εως ηκμαζε] το ν[α]ν
 [τικον ημιν] η[ξι]ωσ[ε] α
 [μννασθε αυτους και δ]ειξ[α]
 495 [τε οτι και μετ ασθεν]ειας
 [και ξυμφορων η υμετε]ρα
 [επιστημη κρεισσω]ν [εστ]ιν
 ετ[ερας ευτυχουσ]η[ς ρωμ]ης
 τ[ους τε] Α[θηναιο]υς [υμων] 64.1
 500 [παλι]ν [αν και ταδε υπομι]
 [μνησκω] οτ[ι ουτε να]ν[ς εν
 [τοι]ς νεωσ[οικοις αλλας ο
 [μοι]ας τα[ι]σδε [ουτε οπλιτων
 [ηλι]κ[ι]αν υπε[λιπετε ει τε
 505 [ξυμ]βησ[ε]τ[αι τι αλλο η το
 [κρατειν] υ[μιν τους τε ενθα
 [δε πολεμι]ου[ς ευθυσ επ] εκει
 [να πλ]ε[υσο]μ[ενους και τους
 9 lines lost.

η επιβου[λη των σιδηρων
 545 χειρ]ων [και προς τε τα αλ
 λα ε[ξ]ηρητ[υσαντο ως εκαστα
 κα[ι] προς τουτο τας γαρ πρω 2
 ρας [και της νεως ανω επι
 πολ[υ] κατεβурсωσαν οπως
 550 απο[λίσ]θα[νοι και μη εχοι
 η]
 αντιλαβε[ι]ν [η χειρ επιβαλ
 λομενη· κα[ι] ε[πειδη παν 3
 τα ετ[οι]μα ην [παρεκελευ
 σα]ντο εκειν]ο[ις οι τε
 555 στρατηγοι και [Γυλιππος
 και ελε[ξ]α]ν το[ι]αδ[ε] οτι μεν 66.1
 [κ]αλα [τα] π[ρ]οειρ[γασμενα και
 υ[πε]ρ κ[α]λ[ων] τ[ων μελλον
 [των ο αγων εσται ω Συρα]
 560 κοσ[ιοι και ξυμμαχοι οι
 τε π[ολλοι] δοκειτε ημιν
 [ειδε]ν[α] ο[υ]δε γαρ αν αυ
 [των ο]ντω προθυμως αν
 [τελαβ]εσθε κ[α]ι ει τις μη ε
 565 [πι οσον] δε[ι] ησθ[ηται σημα
 [νουμεν] Αθη[ναιους γαρ 2
 [εσ την χωραν τηνδε ελ]
 [θοντας π]ρωτο[ν] μεν επι
 [της Σικελ]ια[ς καταδουλω

Col. xii.

570 [σει] επ[ει]τ[α ει] κα[τορθωσει] 66. 2
 [αν] και τη[ς Π]ελ[οποννησου
 [τε] και τη[ς αλ]λης Ε[λλαδος
 [και] α[ρ]χη[ν] την ηδη [μεγισ
 [την] τ[ων τε] περι[ν] Ε[λληνων
 575 [και τ]ω[ν] υ[ν κ]ε[κ]τ[η]με

Col. xiii.

[ευρ]ησ[ουσι πως ου σφαλουσι] 67. 2
 [τε] τας [ναυς και εν σφισιν
 [αυ]τοις πα[ντες] ουκ εν τωι
 625 [αυ]των τροπωι [κινουμε
 [νοι] ταραξ[ονται] επει και 3
 [τω]ι πληθ[ει των νεων

- [νους πρωτοι α]νθ[ρωπων υ
 [ποστ]αυτ[ες τωι ναυτικωι
 [ωιπε]ρ παν[τα κατεσχον
 [τας μ]εν [νενικηκατε ναυ
 18 lines lost.
- 598 κ[ησεως προσγεγενημε 67. 1
 ν[ης αυτωι το κρατιστους
 600 ε[ιναι ει τους κρατιστους ενι
 κη[σαμεν διπλασια] εξα[στου
 η [ελπις τα δε πο]λλα προς
 [τας επιχειρησ]εις η με
 [γιστη ελπ]ις μεγ[ιστην
 605 [και την π]ροθυμια[ν πα]ρε
 [χεται τα τ]ε της α[ν]τιμι 2
 [μησεως α]υτων [της πα
 [ρασκευη]ς η[μω]ν τωι
 [μεν ημε]τερ[ωι] τροπωι
 610 [ξυνηθη τε] εστ[ι κα]ι ουκ ανα
 [ρμοστοι π]ρος εκ[ασ]τον [
 [αυτων εσομεθα οι] δ' επ[ει
 [δαν πολλοι μεν οπλιται]
 [επι των] κα[ταστρωματων
 615 [παρα το] καθε[στηκεσ]ι
 [πολλοι δε] ακο[ντισται
 [χερσαιοι] ως ειπ[ειν Α
 [καρνανες] τε και α[λλοι ε
 [πι ναυς αναβα]ντες οι
 620 [ουδ οπως καθεξομενους]
 [χρη το βελος αφειναι]
- [ουκ ωφελ]ησονται ει τις
] κ[αι] τοδε υμ[ων οτι ουκ ισαις
 630 [ν]α[ν]μαχη[σ]ει πεφοβηται
] εν ολιγ[ω] γαρ [πολλαι αργοτε
]ραι με[ν] ες το δραν τι ων βου
]λοντα[ι] εσοντα[ι] ρασται δ' ες
] το βλαπτ[εσ]θα[ι αφ ων
 635 [η]μ[ι]ν παρεσ[κ]ευασται το 4
 [δε αληθεστατον γνωτε]
 [εξ ων η]μεις οι[ομεθα] σα
 [φως πε]πυ . . σθ[αι υπερβαλ
 [λοντων γ]αρ αυτ[οις των
 640 [κακων κα]ι βια[ζομενοι
 [υπο της π]αρου[σης αποριας
 [εσ απονοια]ν κα[θεστηκα]
 [σιν ου παρ]ασκ[ευης πιστει]
 [μαλλον η τ]υχ[ης αποκιν]
 645 [δυνευσει] ουτ[ως οπως
 [δυναντα]ι [ι]ν η [βιασαμε
 [νοι εκπλευ]σσωσι[ν η κατα
 [γην μετ]α τουτο [την απο
 [χωρησιν] ποιω[νται] ως
 650 [των γε π]αροντων [ουκ αν
 [πραξου]τες χειρ[ον προς 68. 1
 [ου]ν [ατ]αξιαν τε [τοιαυτην
 [και τυχη]ν ανδ[ρ]ων εαυτην
 [παρ]αδεδωκ[υια]ν πολεμι
 655 [ωτατ]ων οργη π[ροσ]μει
 [ξ]ωμεν· και νομ[ισω]μεν
 [αμα μ]εν υ[ομιμω]τατον
 [ει]ναι π[ρος τους εναντιους
 οι αν ω]ς επι τιμωρια του
 660 προσπ[εσοντος] δικαιως
 ιωσι α[ποπλησαι] της γνω
 [μης το θυμουμενον αμα]

[δ εχθρ]ους ἀ[μυνασθαι εκγε
 [νησο]μενον η[μιν και το
 665 [λεγο]με[ν]ο[ν που ηδιστον
 [ειν]αι· ω[ς δ εχθροι και ε 2
 7 lines lost.

Col. xx.

I line lost.

675 [ανειλόντο και απο]πλευ 72. 1
 [σαντες προς την πολ]ιν τρο
 [παιον εστησαν οι δ]ε Αθη 2
 [ναιοι υπο μεγεθους] των
 [παροντων κακων νε]κ[ρ]ω̄
 680 [μ]εν π[ε]ρι η των ναυαγι
 [ων] ουδ̄ ε[πενοουν αιτη
 [σαι] αναι[ρεσι]ν [τ]ης δ[ε] νυ
 [κτος] ε[βο]υ[λ]ευοντο ευθυς
 [αναχωρ]ειν· Δημοσθε 3
 685 [νης δε Νικ]ι[α προσελθων
 [γνωμην ε]π[ο]ιειτ[ο] πληρω
 [σαντα]ς ε[τι] τας [λοι]πας τῶ
 [νε]ων βι[α]σασ[θ]αι ην δυ
 [νων]ται αμα εω[ι] τον εκ
 690 [πλου]ν λεγων οτι πλειους
 [αι λο]ιπαι νηες χρησιμαι
 [σφισιν] η τ[οι]ς πολεμοις· η
 [σαν γα]ρ [τ]οις μεν Αθηναιοις
 [περι]λοιποι ως εξηκον
 695 [τα τ]οις δε πολεμοις ε
 [λασσο]υς η πεντηκοντα·
 [και ξυ]γχωρουντος Νικιο[υ]
 [τηι γυ]ωμη και βουλο[μ]ε
 νων πληρουν αυτων ο[ι]
 700 ναυται ο[υκ] ηθελον εσβ[αι

Col. xxi.

[α]λλ̄ εξελ[θ]οντας ηδη π[αν 73. 1
 [τα]ς Συρακο[σ]ιους και τ[ους
 ξυ]μαχ[ο]υς τας τε ο[ιδους
 απ[οικοδο]μησαι και τ[α στε
 725 νοπορα των χωριω]ν προ
 φθασαντας φυλασσε[ιν
 οι δε ξυ]ν[ε]γιγνωσκον μ[εν 2
 και αυτοι ου[χ] ησσον ταυτ[α
 εκεινου α και εδοκει πο[ι
 730 [η]τεᾱ ειναι· τους δ̄ ανθ[ρω
 [πο]υς αρτι ασμενους απο [̄
 [τ]ε ναυμαχιας μεγαλης [πε
 [παυ]μενους και αμα εορ [̄
 τ[ης ο]υσης ετυχε γαρ αυ[τοις
 735 Ηρακλει ταυτην την ημ[ε
 ραν θυσια ουσα ου δοκει[ν ā
 ραδιως εθελησαι υπακου [̄
σαι· υπο γαρ του περιχαρους [̄
 της νικης προς ποσιν τε [̄
 740 τραφθαι τους πολλους εν [̄
 τηι εορτηι· και παντα
 μαλλον ελπιζειν αν σφω[ν
 πε[ι]θεσθαι αυτους η οπ[λα
 λαβοντας εν τωι παροντι [̄
 745 ε[ξ]ελθειν· ως δε τοις αρχου[σι 3
 τ[αυ]τα λογιζομενοις εφαι
 [νε]το απορα [κ]αι ουκ επειθε [̄

- νει[ν] δια [το] καταπεπλη [
 [χθαι] τ[ε] τη[ι] [ησ]ση και μη [
 [αν ετι] οιεσθαι κρατησαι·
 και [οι] μεν ως κατα γην
 705 ανα[χ]ωρησ[α]ν[τ]ες ηδη
 ξυμπ[α]ντες την γ[ν]ωμη
 ειχον· Ερμοκρατης δε ο 73. 1
 Συρακ[οσ]ι[οσ] υπονοησας αυ
 των την [δι]ανοιαν και νο
 710 μισας [δ]εινον ειναι ει το
 [σ]αυτη στρατια κατα γην
 απ[ο]χωρησ[α]σα και καθε
 [ς]ομεν[η] πο[υ] της Σικελι
 ας βουλ[η]σε[ται] αυθις σφι
 715 [σι] τον π[ο]λ[ε]μον ποιεισθαι
 [ε]σηγειτ[αι] ελθων τοις
 [εν τε]λ[ε]ι ουσι ως ου χρεων
 [α]ποχωρησαι της νυκτ[ο]ς
 [αυ]τους περιιδειν λεγων
 720 [τα]υτα α και [α]υτωι εδοκει
- αυτους ο Ερμοκρατης αυτος
 [επι] τουτοις ταδε μ[η]χανα
 750 [ται] δεδιως μη οι Αθηναι
 [οι] καθ ησυχιαν φθασωσι εν
 [τη]ι νυκτι διελθοντες τα
 [χα]λεπωτατα των χωριων
 πεμπει των εταιρων τι
 755 νας τ[ων] ε[αυτου] μετα ιπ
 πων [προς] το των Αθη
 ναιων [στρατ]οπεδον η
 ν[ι]κα ξ[υ]νεσκ[ο]ταζε· οι προσ [
 ελασα[ντες εξ] οσου τις εμε[λ
 760 λε ακουσεσθαι] και ανακα
 λεσαμενοι [τιν]α[ς] ως ου
 τες των Αθηναιων επι
 τ[η]δειοι ησαν γαρ τ[ινες] τω Νι
 κ[ια] διαγγελοι των εν[δο
 765 θεν] εκελευον φραζειν [
 Νικια μη απαγειν της ν[υ]
 κτος το στρατευμα ως Συ
 ρακοσιων τας οδους φυλασ [

Col. xxviii.

11 lines lost.

- 780 [κοσιοι εν τ]ουτ[ωι] προελ 78. 5
 [θοντε]ς την διοδ[ον] την
 [εν τ]ωι προσθε α[πετειχι
 [ζον ην] δε λοφ[οσ] καρτε
 [ρος και εκ]ατερω[θεν] αυτου
 785 [χαραδρ]α κρημνωδης ε
 4 lines lost.
 790 [ξυμ]μ[αχων] αυτους ιππεισ 6
 [και α]κο[ντι]στ[αι] οντες πολ
 [λο]ι εκατεροι εκωλουν

Col. xxix.

21 lines lost.

- 840 [σα]ντ[ες] προς το πεδιον 79. 5
] μαλλο[ν] οι Αθηναιοι ην
] λισαντ[ο] τη δε υστε
 [ρ]αια πρ[ου]χωρουν και οι
 [Συρα]κ[οσιοι] προσεβαλλον
 845 [τε παντα]χη αυτοις κυκλω]
 και π[ο]λλους κατετραυμα
 τισ[ο]ν κα[ι] ει μεν επιοι
 εν οι Αθη[ναιοι] υπε]χωρ[ουν]
 ε[ι] δ α]ναχω[ροιεν] επ[ε]κ[ε]ιντο

[και ἐ]σηκοντιζον [τε και
 [παρι]ππευον· και χ[ρο
 795 [νον μ]εν π[ολ]υν εμαχ[ο]ν [
 [το ο]ι Αθηναιο[ι]· επειτ α
 [νεχ]ωρη[σ]αν παλι[ν] ες
 [το αυτ]ο στρατοπεδο[ν]
 [και τα ε]πιτη[δεια ουκετι
 800 [ομοιως] ε[ι]χο[ν] ου γαρ ετι
 18 lines lost.

Col. xxx.

10 lines lost.

879 [αυτη ουκ επι Κα]τα[νης 80. 2
 880 [τωι στρατευματ]ι α[λλα
 [κατ]α [το ετε]ρο[ν μ]ερο[ς της
 [Σι]κελιας το προς Κα]μ[αρι
 [ναν κα]ι [Γε]λα[ν και] τα[ς ταν
 [τη πολεις] κ[αι Ελλ]ην[ιδας
 885 [και βαρ]βαρο[υς κα]υ[σαν 3
 [τες ουν πυρα πολλ]α εχω[ρουν
 [εν τη νυκτι κ]αι α[υτοις
 [οιον φιλει και πα]σι στρα
 [τοπεδοις μαλιστα δε] [τοις
 13 lines lost.
 903 [χωρ]ει· αμ[α δε τη] εω αφι 5
 κνουντα[ι ομως προς την
 905 θαλα[σ]σαν [και εσβαντες
 [εσ] την οδο[ν την Ελωρι
 [νη]ν [κα]λ[ουμενην επο
 [ρευο]ντο [οπως επειδη γε
 [νοιντο] επ[ι τω ποταμω] τω
 910 [Κακ]υπαρ[ει παρα τον πο
 [τ]α[μ]ο[ν] [ιοιεν ανω δια της
 με[σ]ογει[ας ηλπιζον] γαρ
 [κ]αι τ[ου]ς [Σικελους ταυτη

850 [και μαλιστα] τοις [υστα
 [τοις] προσπ[ιπτ]οι[τες
 [ει πως κ]ατ[α β]ρα[χ]υ[ν] τρ[εψα]μ[ε
 [ν]οι παν τ[ο] στρατευμα φο
 [β]ησ[εια]ν και επι πολυ μεν 6
 855 [τοιουτωι τ]ροπ[ω]ι αντει [
 [χον οι Αθηναιοι επε]ι[τα
 12 lines lost.

Col. xxxi.

7 lines lost.

926 [νες εκελευον εν] τ[ο]υτω 81. 1
 [δ ο]ι Συρακοσιοι [και] οι ξυ[μ
 [μ]αχοι ως η τε [η]μερα [ε
 γενετο και εγνωσαν του[ς
 930 Αθηναious απεληλυθο
 τας εν α[[ν]]τ[ια ο]ι [π]ολλοι
 τον Γυλιππον ε[ι]χον εκον
 τα αφε[ι]ναι τους Αθη[ναι
 ους· κ[αι] κατα ταχος διω
 935 κοντ[ε]ς ηι ου χαλεπως η
 σθανο[ν]το κεχωρηκοτας
 καταλ[αμβανουσι] περι αρισ
 του ωρα[ν] και ωσπερ προσεμι 2
 ξαν τοι[ς] μετα του Δημοσθε
 940 νους υσ[τεροις] τ ουσι και σχο
 [λαιτερον και ατακτοτερον]
] χωρουσ[ιν] ως της νυκτος
] τοτε ξυνεταρ[αχθησαν
 [ε]υθυς προσπεσ[οντες] εμα
 945 [χ]ο[ν]το· και οι ιππ[εις] των
 [Συ]ρακοσιων εν[εκκ]λουν
 [το] τε ραιον αυ[τους] διχα

- ους [μ]ετ[επεμψαν απαν
 915 τησεσ[θ]α[ι ε]π[ειδη δε] ε[γε 6
 νοντο επ[ι] τωι [ποτα]μωι
 [ε]υρον κα[ι] ενταν[θα] φυλα [
 κη[ν] τ[ιν]α των Συρα[κοσ]ι[ων]
- Col. xxxii.
15 lines lost.
- 984 μ[αλλον ην ετι η προς των 81. 5
 985 Α[θηναιων και αμα φειδω
 τ[ε τις εγιγνετο επ ευπρα
 γ[ιαι ηδη σαφει μη προ
 α[ναλωθηναι τωι και ε
 υ[ομιζον και ως ταυτη τη
 997 ἴ[δεα καταδαμασαμενοι
 λη[ψεσθαι αυτους επειδη 82. 1
 γο[υν δι ημερας βαλλοντες
 παν[ταχοθεν τους Αθηναι
 ους κ[αι ξυμμαχους εωρων
 995 ηδη [τεταλαιπωρημενους
 τοις τ[ε τραυμασι και τη
 αλλη[ι κακωσει κηρυγμα
 ποιου[νται Γυλιππος και
 οι Συρ[ακοσιοι και ξυμμα
 1000 χοι π[ρωτον μεν των νη
 σιωτω[ν ει τις βουλεται ε
 π ελευ[θεριαι ως σφας απι
 [εν]αι· κ[αι απεχωρησαν τι
 7 lines lost.
- 1011 τ[ε βιαιως μητε δεσμοις μητε 2
 τ[η]ς [αναγκαιοτατης εν
 δεια[ι διαιτης και παρεδο 3
 σαν [οι παντες σφας αυτους
 1015 εξακ[ισχιλιοι και το. αργυ
- [ηδη οντ]ας κα[ι ξυν]ηγον
 [εσ ταυτο το δε Ν]ι[κιο]υ στρα 3
 950 [τευμα απειχε] εν τ[ω]ι προ
 [σθε κ]αι [πεν]τηκον[τ]α στα
 [δious θ]α[σσο]ν τε γα[ρ] ο
 [Νικια]ς ηγ[ε] νομι[ζ]ω[ν ου
 [το υπ]ομενε[ι]ν εν τωι τ[οι
 955 [ο]υτ[ωι] εκοντας εινα κ[αι
 ο
 [μ]αχεσθαι σωτηριαν· α[λ
 [λ]α το ως ταχιστα υποχ[ω
 [ρ]ειν τοσαυτα μαχομ[ενους
 [οσ]α αναγκαζονται· ο δε Δη 4
 960 [μο]σθενης ετυγχανε τ[ε
 [τα πλ]ειω εν πονω ξυν[εχε
 [στερ]ω ων δια το ὑστερω [ανα
 [χωρουν]τι αυτωι πρωτω[ι] επ[ι
 [κεισθαι] τους πολεμιοις· και [το
 965 [τε γνους] τους Συρακοσιοις διω[
 [κοντας ο]υ προухωρει μαλ
 [λον η εσ] μαχην ξυνετασ
 [σετο [[. . .]]] ενδιατρειβων

ριον [ο ειχον απαν κατε
 θεσα[ν εσβαλοντες ες ασ

	Fr. 1.	Fr. 2.	Fr. 3.	Fr. 4.
]θραπρ[]·[]ι[.]τια[
]ναιδ·[]αιτ[]·[]ατ€[
]μοι[]ιτ[]να[]·π[
]·ογ·[]··ι·[]ο[]ι··τ[
5]ομ[5]·[5]υτ[5]·[
]·[]η·[]€[
]α[
	Fr. 5.	Fr. 6.	Fr. 7.	Fr. 8.
]α·[]ι]·[α[
]·σοι[]€]·[και[
]βι[]αι]ρα[δ[
]αν[]·]·[ο[
5]ω·[5]ι	5]·[5]·[
	Fr. 9.	Fr. 10.	Fr. 11.	Fr. 12.
]·ι[]·[]υ[]·
]πν[]τ·[]ται·[]θ€[.]
]α··[]··τοτ[[]]·
]στ[]θ[]κτ[]η
	Fr. 13.	Fr. 14.	Fr. 15.	Fr. 16.
]π[]α·[]ογ[]ανι[
]τ[]τω προ[]τα[]πωι π[
	[]]αρ[]τιτ[]υ[
]λ·[
	Fr. 17.	Fr. 18.	Fr. 19.	Fr. 20.
]·[]·[·[.]·[]δ[
]σο[]τι[καθ[]·[
]·[]υ[·α[]·υμ[

Fr. 21. α[αι[εα . [Fr. 22.] . . []κλ[] . γ[Fr. 23.]η[] . τ[]τη[Fr. 24.]ατα[]σγε[]ε[
Fr. 25.] . []νε[]ηρ[Fr. 26.]τον[]απα[] . [Fr. 27.]πολ[]ενε[end of column.	Fr. 28.]αι[]υ εργα· τη . . [
Fr. 29.]α[]εαι[Fr. 30.]α[]ν[Fr. 31.]τει[]τ[Fr. 32.]ε[]ν[
Fr. 33.]ε]ε	Fr. 34.]σ[]η[Fr. 35.]ψ[]χέα[Fr. 36.]α . []ι[Fr. 37.]ε[]υβοια[
Fr. 38.]τοτεσ[Fr. 39.]ε[Fr. 40.]τονα > end of column.	Fr. 41.]κην[
Fr. 42.]ικ . [Fr. 43. α[Fr. 44.] . α[Fr. 45.]ι[

3. *Τυρρηνοι*: *Τυρσηνοι* MSS., edd.

4. *τοι πεζωι*: *των πεζων* MSS. The dative (instrumental) is meant to balance *τῶ ἄλλῳ στρατοπέδῳ* (ll. 5-6); but *τροπήν ποιείσθαι* with the gen. occurs in ii. 19. 2, and the dative may well be a mere slip; cf. *εναντ[ια]* for *εν αυτ[ια]* in l. 931.

9. *και*: so ACEFGM, edd.; om. B.

10. *γαρ*: *μεν γαρ* MSS. *μεν* is superfluous, as is remarked by the scholiast, there being no answering *δε* but another *μεν* in l. 13.

14. *πα]ν[τι ηδη*: so, with the remark *δη γράφεται*, B; *παντι δη* ACEFGM, edd. *ηδη* has already occurred in l. 9, and its repetition so soon after must be wrong, but the size of the lacuna distinctly favours the supposed agreement with B. The same question between *ηδη* and *δη* arises in l. 19, where Π, though imperfect, favours *δη* against *ηδη* of the MSS., and again in l. 948.

17. *στρ[ατ]ειας*: so edd., following the correction of Aem. Portus; *στρατιās* MSS. Cf., however, l. 184, where Π has *στρατια* and most MSS. *στρατεία*. No regularity was observed by scribes in the use of these words.

19. δ]η: ηδ]η (MSS.) is too long and Gertz had already conjectured δή here. ἤδη, which occurred recently in l. 9 and by an error in l. 14 (cf. note *ad loc.*), is less appropriate.

ομ[οτ]ρο[πο]ι[s]: ὁμοιοτρόποις BCFG^e, edd., ὁμοιοτρόποις AE, ὁμοιοτρόπως MG. suprascr. The surface of the papyrus is much damaged and the supposed ρο very uncertain, but ομ[οι]οτ[ρο(πο)]ι[s] and ομ[οιο]τρ[οπο]ι[s] are unsuitable. ὁμοιότροπος occurs once elsewhere in Thuc. (iii. 10. 1), but not ὁμότροπος. Herodotus, however, speaks of ἤθεα ὁμότροπα (viii. 144).

22-3. ναὺς καὶ ἵππους καὶ [μ]εγέ[θη] ε[χ]ου[σαι]s: ναυσὶ καὶ ἵπποις καὶ μεγέθει ἐχούσαις MSS., except B (ναῦς καὶ ἵππους) C (μεγέθη) M (μεγέθη suprascr.) f² (μεγέθη) and a² (ναῦς καὶ ἵππους καὶ μεγέθη αὐχούσαις. Duker's emendation ἰσχυούσαις for ἐχούσαις is accepted by Hude and Stuart Jones; Π supports the simpler ἐχούσαις with the accusatives, as preferred by the older editors. The chief objection to it is that the plural of μέγεθος is not found elsewhere in Thuc.; but cf. Stahl's note and p. 160.

42. μονο]ν: or, less probably, σωθηνα]ι, omitting ετι in the next line with F.

45. κώλυσο]ν[σι]: so C, followed by Hude and Stuart Jones; κωλύσωσι ABEFGM. Cf. 1247. 23, which agrees with C in reading λήσουσι, not λήσωσι, after ὄπως.

49. [τα: so ACEFGM, edd.; om. B. τα is necessary to fill the lacuna.

58. φοβ[ο]ν: so CG, edd.; φόβωι ABEFM.

63. ανενεγκειν: ενεγκειν MSS. except M, which has επενεγκειν owing to the preceding επενεχθησόμενον. For ἀναφέρειν in the sense of 'sustain' in Thuc. cf. iii. 38. 3 αὐτὴ δὲ τοὺς κινδύνους ἀναφέρει.

64-5. αυτ[ων αιτιο]ι: so ACEFGM, Hude, Stuart Jones; αἴτιοι αὐτῶν (αὐτῶν suprascr.) B, Classen.

66. There is not room at the end of the line for [ι υπο των επει], the reading of ABEFM and edd. υπο is also omitted by C and some of the later MSS.

67. επι πο[λ]ν: πολύ MSS.

68. The supposed traces of [δ]ε αξ[ιος] are very slight, and the supplement at the end of the line somewhat long, for the ξ comes under μ of θανμ[ασθησε]; but no variant here is known, and neither ην [δ] αξι[ος] nor ην [α]ξι[ος] suits the vestiges. For final ν represented by a stroke cf. ll. 679 and 687.

72-4. The words των αλλων . . . αλλα και are omitted in M owing to homoioteleuton.

πολλ[ων]: so ABCFGM, edd.; πόλεων E.

76-7. με]τα Κορι[νθιων]: so ABCEFM, edd.; μετὰ τῶν Κορ. G.

80. προκι]νδυν[ευσαι]: προκινδυνεύσαι τε MSS.; but τε spoils the construction and is bracketed by Hude, following Krüger. Since the ν of δυν comes under the final ν of νων in l. 78 and above the final ν of ναυτικου in l. 81, it is probable, though by no means certain, that τε was omitted. The supposed δ of δυν is very doubtful, the vestiges suiting τ better.

81. μ[εγα] μερος: so MSS., Stuart Jones; Hude brackets μέρος with Krüger and Stahl, but Π must have had it.

83-4. πολιν ταυ]την: so ACEFGM, edd.; B has ταύτην πόλιν with β and α superscribed.

85. [πλην γε το]ν: so B; ACEFGM, edd. insert δή after γε, but neither | [πλην γε δη το]ν nor [πλην | γε δη το]ν suits the size of the lacuna, since ξ of ξ[ν]μ[παντος] is under the ξ of ξ[υνηλθε] in l. 84.

86. After ξύμπαντος the MSS. have λόγου του which is not at all satisfactory. Heilmann conjectured ξυλλόγου του, Krüger ὄχλου του, which is accepted by Hude but not by Stuart Jones. λογου or οχλου is rather short for the lacuna, which has room for six letters before του εν], but ξ[ν]μ[παντος] ξυλλογου is unlikely and [λογου του εν τωδε] τω[ι πο] inadmissible, although it is not quite certain that τω belongs to τωδε rather than to τωι.

90. Σικελιαν]: so MSS., Stuart Jones; Hude adopts Krüger's conjecture Σικελία. The τ of τ[ε] comes under αρ of γαρ in l. 89, and the reading of the MSS. yields 16 letters where l. 89 has 14½, so that Σικελιαι even without iota adscript would be long enough; but in the

absence of very strong reasons for the dative (cf. Stahl's note) *Σικελίαν* is more probable; cf. ll. 94-5, note.

91. το]ι[s : so ABCEGM, edd.; τούς F.

93. ε]λθ[οντες : so ABCEFM, edd.; om. G.

94. [ξυνδι]ασω[σ]οντ[ες : so B (suprascr.) E (-σωισ-), edd.; ξυνδιασώσαντες ABCFM.

94-5. Συρακουσ]ας : so MSS., Stuart Jones; Bauer's emendation *Συρακούσαις* is accepted by Stahl and Hude; cf. the former's note. The vestige before *s* suits *a* distinctly better than *ι*. The objection to *ἐπὶ Συρακούσας* is that since *ἐπολέμησαν* applies to both sides *ἐπὶ Σ. ἐπολ.* must mean not 'made war against S.' but 'came to S. for the war', which is awkward if *ἐπὶ Σικελίαν* is retained in l. 90, where Π's reading is unfortunately doubtful.

99. εκαστ]οις : so AB (suprascr.) CEFGM, Hude, Stuart Jones; *ἕκαστοι* B and Paris. 1638, which reading if retained would require *εσχον* in l. 101, as in several of the late MSS.

103. Δω]ριεας : so MSS. and cf. ll. 133 and 191; *Δωριᾶς* Hude, Stuart Jones. This line seems to have been unusually long owing to a desire not to divide *Συρακοσίους* between two columns. There happens to be no quite certain instance in Π of such a division, but Cols. vii, xii, and xxii probably began in the middle of a word. The division *Συρακοσίους* does not suit ll. 104-14.

109. Εστι]αιης : so ACEF, edd.; *Ἔστιαιῆς* BGMc².

110. Εσ[τ]ιαί]αν οικου]ν]ρε[s : so MSS.; these words are bracketed by Hude, following Krüger. That the fragment containing the doubtful *εσ* and *οικ* in the next line is rightly placed is not certain.

121-2. The fragment containing *a* of *a[πο* and *δ* of *δ[ριοι* is not certainly to be placed here. M omits *και* before *Αν]δ[ριοι* and C before *Τη]οι*.

Τη]οι : so ACEFGM; *Τήμοι* B, edd.; cf. p. 160. The traces of a stroke after *η* suit *ι* better than *ν*, and the line is already rather long.

125. οντες φο]ρου : so ACEFGM, edd.; B places *φόρου* before *οὐχ ὑποτελείς*.

127. ξυνεσπ]οντο : so ABCEFGM, Stuart Jones; *ξυνείποντο* Hude with three of the late MSS.

130. The supposed stop after *Καρυστ[ιω]ν* is doubtful.

133. [. . . .]ες γε : *Ἴωνές γε* B, edd.; *Ἴωνές τε* ACEFGM. *γε* is right, but *Ἴωνες* could be dispensed with, being a repetition of what has been stated in l. 128; cf. notes on ll. 142 and 152. Moreover if the letter preceding *ες* was *ν*, and not *α*, *δ*, or *λ*, the last stroke ought to be visible in a vacant space before *ες*. The surface of the papyrus is, however, damaged, and part of the *ν* may have been rubbed off. *Ἴων]ες γε* is satisfactory enough by itself, but it is difficult to fill up the lacuna. *ως*, i. e. *ὦς*; due to the preceding *ὄμως*, is hardly long enough.

139. κτισασι : so CEFMB corr. g², edd.; *κτήσασι* ABGc².

Βοι[ω]τοις : so MSS.; *Βοιωτοῖς* (τοῖς) Lindau, followed by Hude and Stuart Jones. *Βοι[ω]τοις* τοῖς is too long.

142. κατ[α]ντικρυ Βοιωτοις : so Paris. 1636; *καταντικρὺ Βοιωτοῖ Βοιωτοῖς* ABCEFGM, Stuart Jones, *καὶ ἀντικρὺς Βοιωτοῖ Βοιωτοῖς* Hude, adopting a conjecture of Böhme. The meaning of *καταντικρὺ* here has been much disputed. Π's reading apparently connects it with *Βοιωτοῖς*, i. e. 'opposite to' or 'against', not 'outright' or 'on the other hand'. But the omission of *Βοιωτοῖ* is probably a mere error; cf. l. 152, note, and p. 162.

144. κατα : so AEF; *κατ'* CG, *κατὰ τό* BM and some of the late MSS., Hude, Stuart Jones. The angular sign at the end of the line is not certain, but cf. l. 141.

146-7. E omits *οι . . . Κυθηριοι* owing to homoioteleuton.

149. μ[ε]τ : so ABCEFM (*μετά*), edd.; *μετὰ τῶν* G.

150. επεφερον : so B; *ἔφερον* ACEFGM, edd. The supposed stop is uncertain.

152. Δωριης Δωρι]ενσι : om. *Δωριῆς* MSS. Since *Δωριῆς* has already been applied to the

Rhodians in l. 145 it is unnecessary here, but *Δωριῆς ἐπὶ Δωρίεας* occurs in l. 191, and there are several similar antitheses in this chapter; cf. notes on l. 142, where the divergence between Π and the MSS. is just the contrary to that found here, and 133, where Ἰωνες is repeated in the same sentence by the MSS. (and perhaps Π), much as *Δωριῆς* here.

157. τε (corr. from δε by Π¹): τε ACEFM, edd., δέ B.

162. κατειργ[ομενοι: so ABEFM, edd.; καταργόμενοι C, corr. c².

164. οι Αθη[ν]αιοι: so ABefGM, Stuart Jones; om. οί C, Hude. That Π had οι is not quite certain, but if it was omitted there were only 11 letters where l. 163 has 12 and 165 13.

175-6. εκ Ναυπακτο]υ: so B, Stuart Jones; ἐν Ναυπάκτω ACEFGM, ἐν Ναυπάκτω ἐκ Ναυπάκτου Hude following Classen.

184. στ]ρατια: so EF; στρατεία ABCGM, edd.; cf. l. 17, note.

186. [μεν ου]: so ACEFG, Hude; μὲν γὰρ οὐ B, Stuart Jones, μὲν οὖν M. There is no room for γὰρ in the lacuna if the following της is rightly read, and μεν γαρ ου [τ]η[ς] ξ[υ]μ[μ]αχ[ι] does not suit the vestiges so well, besides yielding a line of 23 letters.

188. [Λακεδαιμονίων [.] .] τε: before τε is what looks like either ω or ο with a line above it, or else τ or γ with a stroke through it, and probably there was a correction. The MSS. read Λακεδαιμονίων τε.

190. ωφελι[as]: so B (ὠφελείας) a² marg., edd.; om. ACEFGM owing to homoioteleuton; cf. ll. 602-4, note.

191. Δωριεας: so MSS.; cf. note on l. 103.

193. The paragraphus below this line is uncertain.

195-6. αει [πολε]μιου[ς]: so ACEFGM, edd. (αίει); λειπομένους B.

197-8. ειωθ]οτε[ς ἴ]εναι: so B, avoiding a hiatus, followed by Bekker; ἴεναι ειωθότες ACEFGM, Hude, Stuart Jones. One of the dots over ι is visible.

223-4. Εγε[σ]ταιοι: so ACEFGM; Ἐγεσταῖοί τε B, Hude, Stuart Jones. The exact position of this fragment is uncertain and Εγε[σ]ταιοι τε or Εγε[σ]ταιοι τε can also be read, with επηγα]γον[το] και Σικελιωτων in ll. 224-5. Σικελῶν is the reading of B, preferred by Hude and Stuart Jones, Σικελιωτῶν of ACEFGM. Whichever arrangement be adopted, Π seems to have agreed once with B against the rest, once with the rest against B, rather than with or against B in both cases where this MS. differs from the others.

226. Τ[υρρηνων: cf. l. 3.

234. κα: l. και.

οι[κ]ο[υ]ντες]: so ABefGM, edd.; οί οικόουντες C.

235. μετ [αυ]τους: so BCEGM², edd.; μετὰ τοὺς AF.

236. ησυχ[αζοντων: so ABefGM, edd.; om. C.

267-79. The division of lines in both fragments of Col. vi is quite uncertain.

277. ο [αλλος: so B, Stuart Jones; ἄλλος ACEFGM, Hude.

310-14. It is not certain that the fragment containing the beginnings of lines is correctly placed here, so that the division of lines is doubtful.

323-39. The division of lines is uncertain. With the ordinary reading of the MSS. ll. 327-35 are rather long, and perhaps there were some omissions. That Π agreed with C in reading τῶν for τά in l. 327, or with B in having ἀσθενοῦσιν and ἀπάσας for ἀσθενέει(ν) and πάσας in ll. 332 and 335 is unlikely. The supposed λ of αλ]λ[ου in l. 334 is very doubtful; it may be the π of πεζου.

337. ε[σ]βιβαζοντες: so BCf², edd.; but ε[σ]βιαζοντες (AEFM) is equally possible. It is fairly clear that the scribe first omitted πληρωσαι και διαναναμαχησαντες (so MSS.) owing to homoioteleuton, and then corrected his mistake, partly at any rate, by expunging ην μεν. The missing πληρωσαι may have been inserted in the margin.

350. κ]αι: so ABefGM, edd.; om. C.

352. [...]*as*: om. MSS. Perhaps [*παντ*]*as* or [*εσ αυτ*]*as* or [*ταυτ*]*as*, though none of these is any improvement.

356. *απασ[αι]*, the reading of Π¹, does not occur elsewhere as a variant for *αι πασαι* (MSS., Π²).

358. *τε επ*: so ACEFGM, edd.; τ' *επ* B, τ' *εσ* Krüger.

362-3. *τα αλλα ω[ς οιον τ ην] και ως εξ αναγκ[αιου τε και: ταλλα ως οιδόν τ' ην εξ αν. τ. κ.* MSS., except B which has *ως* above *σσα*. It is not certain that Π had *ω[ς]* rather than *ο[σα]*, and l. 363 is long enough without *τε*. *σσα οιδόν τ' ην και ως* can hardly be right, and if *ως οιδόν τ' ην* be retained, *και ως* becomes superfluous, being perhaps due to a misunderstanding of τ'. *εξ αναγκαίου τε και τοιαύτης διανοίας* is a somewhat difficult expression, in which it is not clear whether *αναγκαίου* is feminine or neuter.

386-96. The division of lines is uncertain.

399. *αι*: so MSS.; *αιεί* Hude, Stuart Jones; cf. l. 195.

405. *αυ[των]*: so BCEFGM, edd.; om. A.

406-7. *παρεσκευα[ζεσθ]ε* (corr. by Π³ from *-θ[αι]*): so BG; *παρεσκευάζεσθαι* ex. corr. c², *παρεσκευάζεσθε* ACEFMg², edd. After this the MSS. have *α δε αρωγα ενειδομεν*, which seems to have been seriously corrupted in Π, *α δε* becoming *τιο*. (?) and *ενειδομεν* becoming *οι μεν*: the reading of the MSS. is superscribed by Π³.

410-11. *εσ[ε][σθ]αι*: the division *ε[σεσθ]αι* leaves l. 410 too short, although *[σθ]* is hardly enough for the lacuna at the beginning of l. 411, where three letters would be expected.

425. *τη[ι]*: so ABCEFMg², edd.; om. G.

426. *ηναγκασμεν[η]* or *ηναγκασμε[ν]η[ι]* can be read.

429. *ευρηται*: so MSS.; *ηυρηται* edd.

430. *χρη αυ[τινα]υπηγη[σαι]*: so Ba², edd.; *μη αντιναυπηγείσθαι* (which makes no sense) ACEFGM. B adds *αντιναυπηγείσθαι γράφεται*.

432. *ωπερ*: so ACEFGM; *ωπερ δη* B, edd. Possibly *δη* is lost, the surface of the papyrus being damaged; but this addition would make the line rather long.

442. *ανα[κρο]υεσθαι*: so BCGMf edd.; *ανακρούσεσθαι* AEF.

444. *φαινετα[ι]*: so CEFMg, edd.; *φαινεται* ABM, ABF having *εάν* for *εάν* in l. 443.

447. *[ουσης]*: so ACEFGM, edd.; *εσομενης* (B, with *ουσης* suprascr.) is too long, since there was probably a space before *ων*.

450-2. The letters *a* of *]σθα[ι, υση* of *πε[σ]ο]υση[ς]*, and *ερο* and part of the *τ* of *προ]τερο[ν]* were on a separate fragment which is not certainly to be placed here, *ση* being very doubtful.

452-3. *αξι[ουν . . . η]*: so B (with *γράφεται ην*) f, edd.; but the reading of ACEFGM *αξι[ον . . . ην]* would occupy the same space.

479-80. *ουκ ε]λασσ[σον]*: cf. l. 483, note.

480-1. *ωφελείσθαι ες τε τό* is repeated by mistake in E.

482-3. *το αδικει]σθαι*: so ACEFGM, Hude; *τό μη ιδ.* Ba²e², Stuart Jones, *τό διακεισθαι* some late MSS. The line is long enough without *μη*, but its omission is not certain.

483. [*πολυ πλεον*]: so MSS. (*πλέον* B, *πλείω* CG, corr. g², *πλείον* AEFM). Hude follows Krüger and Stahl in deleting the words as inconsistent with and a gloss upon *ουκ ελασσον* in l. 479, where Classen wished to delete *ουκ ελασσον*, retaining *πολυ πλείον* here. Stuart Jones keeps both phrases, and *κατα τό ωφελείσθαι* is then contrasted with *ες τε τό φουβερὸν τοῖς ὑπηκόοις και τό μη αδικείσθαι*, though this is not very satisfactory. Π, however, clearly had *πολυ πλε(ι)ον*: the stop after *ωφελει]σθαι* suggests that it may have had *δε* for *τε*, as desiderated by Reiske, in l. 481.

486-8. *δικ[αιως αυ]την νυν μ[η καταπρο]δι[δ]οτ[ε]*: the best MSS. are corrupt here, inserting *αν* after *δικαίως*, which is impossible with the imperative (*μη* om. AF, add a²f², *καταπροδίδωτε* E, *-διδώτε* e², *-δοίητε* some late MSS.). The simplest course, followed by Stuart Jones, is to omit *αν* with Bekker, who in so doing claims the support of Paris. 1637, 1638, and 1736;

but this makes *δικαίως* very difficult, since *ἀδικως* would rather be expected. Hude obelizes the passage. Π is unfortunately very imperfect: it is not certain that *ἄν* was omitted, and the supposed traces of *δικ[αιως]* are very doubtful; but reckoning from [τες there are 12 letters in the corresponding space in the lines above and below, and 12 letters are necessary for l. 486 apart from *ἄν*. No support for Madvig's emendation *ἄν . . . καταπροδίδοιτε* is forthcoming, the imperative with *μή* being confirmed. The *μ* of *μ[η]* is fairly certain, for the vestiges do not suit *κ*.

491. The MSS. agree with Π² in reading *ῶν* omitted by Π¹ after [Σικ]ε[λιωτ]ων.

495. *και μετ ασθεν]ειας*: so ACEFGM, edd.; B omits *καί*, but the size of the lacuna here is in favour of it.

496. *υμετε]ρα*: so ABCEFG, edd.; om. M.

499. [υμων]: so edd. from B's *ή ύμῶν*; but [ήμῶν] (ACEFGM) may of course be read.

508. *πλ]ευ[σο]μ[ερους*: so BFM, Stuart Jones; *πλευσουμένων* CE, Hude, *πλευσωμένων* A. *πλευ[σου]μ*. cannot be read.

523-5. The division of lines in this fragment is uncertain, but there is a short blank space after *πολις* in 525. In that line before *υπολοιπος* Π may have had *η*, which is read by edd. with some late MSS., but omitted by ABCEFGM.

544. *επιβου]λη*: so several late MSS.; *ἐπιβολή* ABCEFGM, &c., edd.; cf. *χειρῶν σιδηρῶν ἐπιβολαί* in 434 and p. 162.

545-6. *τα αλ]λα*: τᾶλλα MSS., except C and a few of the later ones which have *πολλά*. Cf. l. 362.

549-50. *οπως] απο[λιστα]νοι*: ὅπως (καὶ ὅπ. M) ἄν ἀπ. MSS. This use of *ἄν* with the optative after *ὅπως* is rare, and Herwerden wished to delete *ἄν* here. The line is certainly long enough without it.

551. *αντιλαβειν (αντιλαβην Π²)*: ἀντιλαβήν MSS., except the Cassellanus (-βεῖν). The β was perhaps retouched.

552-3. *παν]τα ετ[οι]μα*: so ACEFGM, edd.; *ἔτοιμα πάντα* B.

562-3. *αυτων ο]υτω*: so B; *οὕτως αὐτῶν* ACEFGM, edd.

565. *δε]ι*: so BCEFGM, edd.; *δή* A with *δεῖ* suprascr. a².

569-70. The letters *επ* in l. 570, *και* in 571, and *κα* in 572 are a separate fragment which is not certainly to be placed here, and up to 579 the division of lines in Col. xii is doubtful. The supposed *ε* of *επ[ει]τ[α]* in 570 is rather large, and might well be the beginning of the line, but if so 569 must have been shorter than the MSS. reading (? *δουλωσει* for *καταδουλωσει*), or else *καταδουλωσει* | projected considerably in order to avoid dividing it between two columns; cf. l. 103, note.

επ[ει]τ[α]ει: *ἔπειτ' εἰ* ACEFGM, edd.; *ἔπειτα δὲ εἰ* B.

571-2. *Πε]λ[οποννησου | τε]*: so B; om. *τε* ACEFGM, edd. *Πε]λ[οποννη]σου*, omitting *τε*, is somewhat less probable.

576-7. *υποστ]αντ[ες]*: so MSS. The two letters following *α* have been corrected, perhaps from *λε*, i. e. *υποσταλεντες*.

598-602. The beginnings of these lines with the two paragraphi are on a separate fragment, which is doubtfully assigned to this position. Line 600 is rather long (24 letters; om. *τους*?), and a paragraphus is hardly expected after l. 597. The doubtful *κ* in l. 601 might be *β*. *το* in l. 599 is the reading of the MSS., retained by Stuart Jones; Hude reads *τοῦ* with Krüger.

602-4. *τα δε πο]λλα . . . ελπ]ις*: so Bf³ edd.; om. (owing to homoioteleuton) ACEFGM; cf. l. 190, note, and p. 159.

611. *εκ[ασ]τον*: so B, Stuart Jones; *τὴν ἐκάστην* ACEFGM, *τὴν (τέχνην) ἐκάστην* Hude.

616. *ακο]ντισται*: so CE; *καὶ ἀκ.* ABFGM, edd. *πολλοι δε και] ακ.* is less probable.

622-44. The division of lines is nearly certain up to l. 635, especially as there is

a short blank space before *εν* in l. 631. The fragment containing ll. 637-44 might go a little further to the left.

625. [αυ]των: so (αὐτῶν) ACF, Hude; *ἐαυτῶν* (which does not suit the size of the lacuna) B, Stuart Jones, αὐτῶ(ι) EGM, corr. g. But [αυ]των may of course be αὐτῶν.

τροπωι: ροπωι is on a separate fragment which is not certainly placed here.

633. εσοντα[ι]: so ABCEFGM, edd.; *ἐσόμεναι* C.

634-5. [αφ ων . . . | η]μ[ι]ν: ἀφ' ὧν ἡμῶν MSS. The attraction of the nominative of the relative clause is unusual, but seems unavoidable. [αφ ων ηδη is possible, but the missing word may have preceded αφ ων.

637-8. σαφως πε]πυ . . σθ[αι]: σαφῶς πεπύσθαι MSS., G having σφίσι γράφεται above σαφῶς. The traces of the letter following πυ suggest η, ν, or π; the next letter has almost entirely vanished. πυθεσθ[αι is not suitable, and would create a difficulty in filling up the preceding lacuna; it is more likely that the scribe misspelled πεπυσθαι, and possibly it was corrected.

644. αποκινδυνευσει] or σποκινδυνευσαι], Duker's generally accepted emendation of the reading of the MSS., can be read.

649. ποιω[νται]: so ABGc²f², edd.; but ποιω[νται] (CEFM) is possible.

652. [ατ]αξίαν: so ABCEFGM, edd.; ἀταξία C, corr. c².

654. [παρ]αδεδωκν[α]ν: so ABCEFGMc², Stuart Jones; παραδεδωκῶν C, Hude.

660-1. δικαίως ἴωσι: δικαίωσωσι C, δικαίωσωσιν ABCEFGMc², edd. In this awkwardly constructed sentence δικαίωσωσιν is generally considered to govern ἀποπλήσαι, and οἱ ἄν. . . δικαίωσωσιν ἀποπλήσαι τ. γν. τὸ θυμ. has to serve as the subject of νομιμώτατον εἶναι; cf. ii. 44. Ἴ τὸ δ' εὐτυχές, οἱ ἄν. . . λάχωσι . . . καὶ οἷς . . . ξυνεμετρήθη. With δικαίως ἴωσι, however, ἀποπλήσαι is to be connected with νομιμώτατον εἶναι and balances ἀμύνασθαι better. The other difficulties, the fact that ἐναντίους is not the antecedent of οἷ, the change from the infinitive to the participle after νομίσωμεν, and the superfluous καί before τὸ λεγόμενον, are not apparently affected by Π's readings.

663-6. The division of lines in this fragment is not quite certain.

664. η[μιν και]: so MSS. except Paris. 1638, which omits και. και had been deleted by Reiske and is rejected by Classen and Hude but retained by Stuart Jones; it is indispensable in Π, if η[μιν is right. τ[ε ημιν και, omitting το, might be read.

680-2. των ναναγι[ων] ουδ ε[πενοουν αιτη]σαι] ανα[ρσει]ν: om. των MSS. There was some variant in Π unless l. 680 had only 14 letters, and though in l. 681 [ενο]ουν might be read with some late MSS., the following letter is like ε, not α, and not more than 10 letters would be expected in l. 680 after π[ερι, whereas π[ερι η ναναγιων ουδε | gives 13. αιτησαι αναίρεσιν is unnecessary, but ων | [ενο]ουν ε[.] | . . . ανα[ρσει]ν is less likely than a slight change in l. 680, such as the insertion of των.

683. ε[βο]υ[λ]εοντο: so ACEFGM, Hude, Stuart Jones; ἐβούλοντο B.

691. [αι λο]υπαι: ἔτι αἰ λοιπαί B, ἔτι αἰ λοιπαί εἰσι ACEFGM, edd. Π must have omitted ἔτι or αἰ, probably the former, as well as εἰσί. ἔτι has recently occurred in l. 687, where Classen wished to omit it as an intrusion from the present passage, in which he suggested the omission of αἰ. More probably Π is right in omitting ἔτι here.

695. δε πολεμοις: δ' ἐναντίους ABCEFG, edd., δὲ ἐναντίους M. πολεμοῖς is probably repeated from l. 692.

699. αυτων: so BEMf²g² edd.; αὐτόν ACFG, αὐτάς some late MSS.

702. τ[ε]: so B, Stuart Jones; om. ACEFGM, Hude.

705. ανα[χ]ωρησαι[τ]ες (corr. to -σαντες by Π³): ἀναχωρήσαντες ABCEf², edd., -σαντες CGM.

712. απ[ο]χωρησ[α]σα: so CE, Hude; ὑποχωρήσασα ABFGM, Stuart Jones.

713. πο]ν: so Paris. 1637; ποι ABCEFGM, edd., πη three other late MSS.

716. [ε]σηγεται: so ABCEFGM, edd.; ἐφηγείται c² and some late MSS.

720. *α και*: so BCG, edd.; *καὶ ᾧ* EM, *καὶ ᾗ καὶ* AFg suprascr.
ἔδοκει: so ABCEFG, edd.; *ἔδόκει εἶναι* M.
723. *τας*: so ACEFGM, edd.; *τά* B.
- 724-5. *στε]νοπορα*: so BCEFM, edd.; *στενότερα* AB *γράφεται*.
των χωριω[ν: so ABCEFM, edd.; *τῶι χωρίω* B *γράφεται*.
- 725-6. *προ]φθασαντας*: so ACEFMB *γράφεται*, Hude; *διαλαβόντας* B, Classen, *προδια-*
λαβόντας Stuart Jones. Cf. l. 751, note.
727. *ξυ[ε]γγνωσκον*: so ACFM, edd.; *ξυνεγίνωσκον* BE.
728. *ησσον*: so CEFGM, edd.; *ἦττον* AB.
729. *α*: om. MSS. The insertion of *ᾧ* may have been intended to ease the construction of the infinitive *δοκεῖν ᾧν* in 736 (which depends loosely on *ξυνεγίνωσκον, καὶ ἔδόκει ποιητέα* being parenthetical), but is probably due to a reminiscence of *ᾧ καὶ αὐτῶ ἔδόκει* in l. 720. The ink of *α* is rather faint and it may have been intentionally obliterated. C has *ποιητεο* for *πο[ιη]τέα* (corr. c²).
732. *[τ]ε ναυμαχίας*: *ναυμαχίας τε* MSS. Cf. p. 162.
- 732-3. *πε[παν]μενους*: so B. *αναπε[παν]μενους* (ACEFGM, edd.) is too long.
- 734-5. *αυ[τοις] Ηρακλει*: so ACEFGM, edd.; *Ἡράκλεια* (Ἡρακλεῖ *γράφεται*) B. Hude's conjecture *ταύτη τῇ ἡμέρᾳ* is not confirmed.
736. *δοκει[ν αν*: so MSS., but Π may have omitted *ᾧν*.
739. *τετραφθαι*: so ACEFGM, edd.; *τετάφθαι* B.
747. *ουκ*: so apparently some late MSS. and Krüger, followed by Hude; *οὐκέτι* ABCEFGM, Stuart Jones. Cf. p. 161.
751. *φθασωσι*: *προφθάσωσι* C; *προφθάσωσιν* ABCEFGM, edd. *προφθάσαντας* recently occurred in l. 725 and *προφθάνειν* is not found with a participle elsewhere in Thuc., so that the simple verb may well be right here.
754. *επαιρων*: so BCEFGM, edd.; *έτέρων* A, corr. a².
755. *ε]αντου*: so ABCEFGM, edd.; *έτου* C, corr. c².
758. *ξ[υνεσκ]οταζε*: so C; *ξυνεσκοτάξεν* ABCEFGc², edd.; *ξυνεσκοτάξεν* M.
767. The initial *σ* of *Συρακοσιων* has been corrected or rewritten.
768. The *σ* of *φυλασ[σ]οντων* seems to have been inserted later by Π¹.
- 780-5. The division of lines is uncertain.
782. *προσθε*: *πρόσθεν* ABCEFG, edd., *ἔμπροσθεν* M. Cf. l. 950, note.
792. *εκατεροι*: so ACEFGM; *εκατέρωθεν* B, edd. Cf. p. 160.
- 840-4. The division of lines in this fragment is not quite certain. Line 844 may be shortened by restoring *προσεβαλον* with GM.
852. *τρ[εψα]μ[εν]οι*: so ACEFGM, edd.; *τρ[εψδ]μ[εν]οι* (B) is not well suited to the size of the lacuna.
- 879-89. The arrangement of these lines is fairly secure. To make *κελιας* in l. 882 begin a line does not suit 883, and the division *π[ρος] | Κα]μ[αριναν]* does not suit 879.
881. *μ[ερο]ς*: so ACEFGM, edd.; om. B.
885. *]βαρο[* is on a separate fragment, which is not quite certainly placed here.
909. *επ[ι]*: so B, edd.; *παρά* ACEFGM, obviously from l. 910.
- 911-12. *δια της] με[σ]ογει[ας*: so B; om. *της* ACEFGM, edd. It is not clear that Π inserted it, but if it is omitted the line had only 16 letters, for to read *πο[τ]α[μον]* is less satisfactory, besides reducing l. 910 to 16 letters.
914. *[μ]ετ[επεμψαν*: so ACEFGMB suprascr., Hude; but *[μ]ετ[επεμψαντο* (B, Stuart Jones) is possible.
- 915-16. *[ε]π[ειδη δε] ε[γε]νοντο ογ[ε]π[ει δε εγ]ε[νοντο]* can be read. *επει δ' εγ.* CG, *επειδη δ' εγ.* AEFM, edd., *επειδη δε εγ.* B. The paragraphus below this line was probably added by Π³.

917. [ε]υρον (ABCFGM) is more likely than [η]υρον (E, edd.); cf. l. 429.
931. *εναντ[ια]* (corr. by Π² to *εν αυτ[ια]*): *εν αιτία τε* MSS. *εναντια* is a mere error, but *τε*, which occurred in l. 928, is unnecessary. The surface of the papyrus is damaged after *αυτ[ι]*, but if the corrector had added *τε*, part of it ought to have been visible.
932. *εκ* of *εκοντα* is apparently corrected, perhaps from *αρ*.
- 938-9. *ωσπερ προσεμιξαν*: so ACEFGM (*πρόσέμιξαν*), Hude, Stuart Jones (-*εμει*-); *ὡς προσέμιξαν* B. Π may have had either *ωσ* or *ωσπερ*.
943. *τοτε*: so ACEFGM, edd.; *τε* after an erasure B.
946. *εν[εκυκ]λου[το]*: *ἐνκυκλοῦντο* Paris. 317, *ἐκυκλοῦντο* ABCEFGM, edd. *ἐγκυκλοῦν* does not occur in Thuc., who uses *κυκλοῦν* frequently (the passive occurred in the lost l. 969), but *ἐγκυκλοῦσθαι* is common in writers of the Roman period. Cf. p. 162.
948. [*ηδη οντ*]as: so B with *δη* suprascr.; *δη ὄντας* ACEFGM, edd. The size of the lacuna strongly favours *ηδη*; cf. the confusion of *δη* and *ἦδη* in ll. 14 and 19.
950. *προ[σθε]*: so C, *πρόσθεν* ABCEFG, edd.; *ἐμπροσθεν* M; cf. l. 782, note.
951. *κ[αι]*: so ACEFGM, edd.; *ἐκατὸν καί* B. with some late MSS.
956. *σωτηριαν* (*σωτηριον* Π²): *σωτήριον* with *σωτηρίαν* suprascr. B; *σωτηρίαν* ACEFGM, Hude, Stuart Jones. Classen preferred *σωτήριον*.
959. [*οσ*]a *αναγκάζονται*: so ABCEFGMc, Stuart Jones; *ἕσα ἀναγκάζονται* CK, *ὄσ' ἀν ἀναγκάζονται* Dobree, Hude.
960. *τ[ε]*: so MSS., except two of the late ones, Stuart Jones; Dobree, followed by Hude, wished to omit it, but cf. the next note.
961. *πονω*: so B with the Cassellanus and Paris. 1733, Stuart Jones; *πόνω τε* ACEFGM, Hude; cf. the preceding note. Π is likely to have been right.
963. *πρωτ[ω]*: so ABCEFG², edd.; om. CG.
967. *ξυνετασ[σετο]*: so ABCEFG, edd.; *ξυνετάττετο* CG, *ἦ ξυνετάσσετο* M.
968. Before *ενδιατριβων* there is a correction, the reading of the MSS. being apparently added by Π² above the line. The first (and possibly the second) letter of *ενδιατριβων* is crossed through, but probably by mistake, unless *εν* occurred in the preceding word (*μεν*?). *ἐνδιατρίβων* MSS., edd.
992. *γο[υν]*: so MSS. Hude and Stuart Jones adopt Dobree's correction *δ' οὖν*.
- 999-1000. *οι Συρ[ακοσιοι]*: so the Clarendonianus; om. *οι* ABCEFGM, edd. Cf. p. 161.
- ξυμμα[χοι]*: *οι ξύμμαχοι* MSS.; cf. the preceding note. It is not certain that *οι* was omitted, but the lacuna is of the same length as that in l. 998.
1017. It is not certain that any lines are lost at the bottom of this column, which contains 49 lines so far, while Col. xxxi has 50.

Frs. 1-45. These small pieces are not to be regarded as coming from tops or bottoms of columns unless so described in the text.

Fr. 1. 2.]*ναιδ* . [: or]*νδιδ* . [.

Fr. 3.]*νδ*[can be read in l. 3 and possibly *θ* in l. 6, but this fragment is not from ll. 110-15.

Fr. 15. The light colour of this fragment resembles that of Cols. xx-i and xxxi-ii.

Fr. 28. 2. The supposed stop after *εργα* may be a letter.

Fr. 37. 2. Possibly E]*υβοια*[, but not l. 109. The colour of this fragment does not suit Col. iii, so that Σ*τυρ*]*ε[ις* . . . E]*υβοια*[s (ll. 119-20) is also inadmissible, as is]*ε[ξω Πελοποννησο]υ* *βοιω[τοι* in ll. 269-70.

1377. DEMOSTHENES, *De Corona*.

29.1 × 12.4 cm.

Late first century B. C.

This nearly complete column from a roll of the speech *De Corona* is written in upright uncials whose informal character is exaggerated by the largeness of their scale. That the hand is of early date is clear from its style, which recalls that of 216, and a further proof is supplied by the verso, which contains accounts in cursive of the first century. The text on the recto may be ascribed with probability to the latter half of the first century B. C., or at any rate to the reign of Augustus, and thus seems to be the oldest fragment of any speech of Demosthenes hitherto recovered. Pauses in the sense are represented by short blank spaces, in which a high or medial dot is sometimes inserted (by a later hand?); such blank spaces, however, occasionally occur when there is no pause. Paragraphi were also employed (l. 11). A horizontal dash is once used for the purpose of filling up a short line. Remains of a cursive adscript, referring to the previous column, occur in the left margin opposite l. 12.

The text shows a tendency to omission, and was evidently not distinguished by great accuracy, but is not without small points of interest. A coincidence with a reading of Tiberius which was adopted by Blass is noticeable in l. 25.

	ετερων επακολουθειν	§ 167
	γνωμαις ησθην και μαλ	
	λον υμας επαινωι κατα	
	πολλα· και μαλιστα δ επι	
5	τωι βουλευεσθαι τουτων	
	ασφαλεστερον και τα —	
	προς ημας εχειν εν ευ	
	νοιαι· οπερ ου μικραν	
	υμειν οισει ελπιζω ρο	
10	πην εαν περ επι ταυτης	
	μενητε της προθεσεως	
10 ^υ	ουτως διαθεις Φιλιππος	§ 168
	τας πολεις προς αλληλας	
	[δ]ια τουτων και τουτοις	
15	[ε]παρθεις τοις ψηφισμα	
	[σι]ν ηκεν εχων την δυ	
	[ν]αμιν και την Ελατειαν	

[κ]ατελαβεν ως ουδ αν
 [ει] τι γενοιτο συνπνευ [
 20 [σο]ντων ημων και [τ]ων
 [Θ]ηβαιων αλ[λα] μην τον
 [τοτε σ]υμβαντα θορυ [
 [βον τη]ι πολ[ει ι]στ[ε] μεν
 [απαντε]ς μικ[ρα] δ ακου
 25 [σαθ ο]μως τ[α α]ναγκαιο
 [τατα εσπερα] μεν γαρ ην § 169
 [ηκε δ αγγελλ]ω[ν] τ[ι]ς εις

4. και: om. MSS.

5. βουλευεσθαι: βουλεύσασθαι περί MSS. περί is indispensable.

9. 1. οισειν.

11. After προθέσεως the MSS. add ἔρρωσθε.

12. ουτω . . . Φιλιππος: οὕτω . . . ὁ Φ. MSS. For the marginal note cf. introd.

15. ψηφισμα[σι]ν: ψ. και ταῖς ἀποκρίσειν MSS.

19. συνπνευ[σο]ντων: ἔτι συμπνευσόντων F vulg.; ἔτι συμπνευσόντων ἄν SLA, ἔτι συμπνευσάντων ἄν Elmsley, edd.

22-3. σ]υμβαντα θορυ[βον τη]ι πολ[ει: συμβάντα τῆ πόλει θόρυβον A, Blass, συμβ. ἐν τῆ π. θ. other MSS., Butcher.

24. [απαντε]ς (so MSS.) suits the lacuna better than [παντε]ς (Blass).

25. τ[α α]ναγκαιο[τατα: so Tiberius, Blass (τἀναγκ.); ἀναγκαιότατα first hands of SL, αὐτὰ τὰ ἀναγκ. vulg. and Butcher (τἀναγκ.).

27. εις: ὡς (τοὺς πρυτάνεις ὡς Ἐλάτεια κατέιληπται) MSS.

1378. DEMOSTHENES, *Contra Midiam*.

16 × 13.5 cm.

Third century.

The upper part of a column, with the ends of a few lines from the column preceding, written in a medium-sized calligraphic hand of the biblical type. This style of script is now known to go back at least to the beginning of the third century (cf. 661, P. Rylands 16), and the present specimen appears to represent a comparatively early stage in its development. A high stop occurs in l. 11. A diaeresis in l. 10 takes the form of a short horizontal stroke.

Though so carefully written the text is not distinguished by great accuracy, and errors in ll. 11 and 19 remain uncorrected. There is no variant of importance.

Col. i.

Col. ii.

διαν απαντων των ε̄ § 153
 τηι πολ[ει λα]μπροτα

		τον γέγενησθαι απο κναιει γαρ αηδια δηπου 5 και αναισθησια καθ [εκα στην] τ[η]ν εκκλ[ησια]ν ταυ[τα] λεγων ει μ[ε]ντο[ι] § 154 τι π[ο]τ εστι α λιτουργει τηι [α]ληθειαι δει σκοπεῖ 10 εγω προς ὑμας ερω και θεασ[α]σθε ως· και ως αυ τον εξετασω προς ε μαυτον κρι[νω]ν ουτος ω ανδρ[ε]ς Αθην[αι]οι γεγο 15 νως ετη περι πεντη κοντ ισως η μεικρον ελαττ[ο]ν ουδεν εμου πλειους λιτουργιας ν μεν λελιτουργηκεν ος 20 δυο κ[αι] τ[ριακοντα] ετη γεγονα καγωι μεν κα τ ε[κεινους]
	λιτουργια]ς § 151	
	[σκοπει δη μη τουτοις]	
	[αυτον εξαιτησ]ηται	
	[και ελαττω πο]λυ τηι	
5	[πολει καταθεις] η οσα	
	[σοι διδωσι καταγελα]	
	[σηι εγω δε πρωτο]ν με § 152	
	[ουδεν αγενν]εξ υμῶ	
	[καταγιγνωσκω] ουδ ν	
10	[πολαμβανω τι]μησεῖ	

i. 3. The vestiges are doubtfully identified: *ἐξαιτήσεται* edd., *ἐξαιτήσεται* S and some others.

5. οσα: Blass wished to read ὅσον, with *ἐλαττον* for *ἐλάττω*.

ii. 11. ως· και ως: 1. ὡς δικαίως with MSS

17. ελαττ[ο]ν: so S, edd.; *ἐλάττω* other MSS. But ελαττ[ω]ι is also a possible reading.

18. 1. νμειν. The scribe made the slightly lengthened stroke of ι, but then seems to have inadvertently treated it as the first stroke of the ν.

1379. LIVY, i.

14.3 × 10 cm. Late third century. Plate VI.

Livy so far has been represented in the papyri only by a portion of an epitome (668); now we have a fragment—unfortunately but a small one—from Book i of the historian himself. The present MS. resembles the epitome both in being in the form of a roll, and in the character of the script, which is of the mixed uncial style apparently prevalent in the provinces. A few differences are

to be recognized. Minuscule forms are more sparingly employed in 1379 than in 668; there are the usual *b* and *d*, but *m* is of the pure uncial shape, while *r* is in a state of transition between uncial and minuscule. The general resemblance, however, between the hands of the two papyri is so close that they must be of approximately the same date, and since 668 can be assigned with probability to about the end of the third century, 1379 may be referred with little hesitation to the same early period. Punctuation, which in 668 was not employed except with abbreviations, is here rather elaborate, medial and low dots being used for short pauses, and an angular mark in the high position for a more considerable interval (l. 6).

The fragment (cc. v. 6-vi. 1), so far as it goes, shows a correct text; but is too slight to give an insight into its quality or affinities.

	[g]iam venire pastoribu[s	v. 6
	[ad reg]em impetum facit [
	[et a do]mo Numitoris alia [
	[com]parata manu. adiuva[t	
5	[Rem]us. ita regem optrun	
	[cat] N[um]itor in[er] pri [vi 1
	[mu]m t[um]multum hos[tes	
	[invasi]se u[r]bem at[que	
	[adortos reg]iam dict[ita]ns	
10	[cum pube]m Albanam [in	
	[arcem pra]esidio armis[que	
	[opti]nendam avocasset [
	[postquam i]u[ve]nes per[petra	
	[ta caed]e pergere ad se g[ra	
15	tulantis udidit. extemp[lo	
	[advoca]to c[on]cilio. sce[le	
	[ra in se] fr[at]ris. orig[inem	
	[nepotum] ut geniti [

5. *optrum[cat]*: the size of the lacuna is in favour of the singular, which is read by most of the best MSS.

13. The supplement at the end of the line is rather long in comparison with the others, but it would be rash to infer that the papyrus had some shorter word, e. g. *peracta*, instead of *perpetrata*.

16. *sce[le]ra*, not *sce[lu]s* (M), is indicated by the spacing.

18. Above the vestiges of the supposed *u* there is a mark suggesting the top of an *o* or some other round letter. It does not look like an accident, but remains unexplained.

IV. GRAECO-EGYPTIAN LITERARY PAPYRI

1380. INVOCATION OF ISIS.

21.8 × 112.5 cm.

Early second century.

The recto of this long and interesting papyrus contains an invocation (*ἐπίκλησις*) of the goddess Isis, the verso a somewhat analogous composition in praise of Imhotep-Asclepius (1381). As often happens with a roll that has been re-used, the surface of the recto has suffered considerably, and the ink is in many places very faint, rendering decipherment difficult, particularly in the later part where lacunae are more frequent. The twelve consecutive columns, each containing 22-8 lines, are written in a small semiuncial hand with a tendency to cursive forms in certain letters, especially *a* and *ε*. *η* is remarkable for its tall first stroke. Stops, usually in the high position and all having the same value, are common, and after one of these an initial letter is often enlarged. Diaereses are occasionally found, but no breathings or accents. Some corrections, chiefly due to misspellings of *ει* for *ι* or vice versa, have been inserted in an apparently different but probably contemporary hand, though not regularly nor always intelligently (cf. l. 120), besides a few insertions by the scribe himself, who was not very accurate. The handwriting of both recto and verso indicates a date not later than the second century, the recto probably having been written in the reign of Trajan or Hadrian, the verso under the Antonines.

The invocation falls into two sections, the first being concerned with the goddess in her well-known capacity of *πολυώνυμος* (cf. ll. 97 and 101) and giving an elaborate list of her titles in towns or nomes of Egypt (ll. 1-76), and then in towns, districts, or countries in other parts of the world (ll. 76-119). The second section begins with a continuation of similar complimentary titles (ll. 119-42) still governed by *ἐπικαλοῦμαί σε*, which no doubt occurred at the lost beginning of the first section, and proceeds in ll. 142-298 to a long and somewhat disconnected prose hymn of praise addressed to the goddess, dealing with the various aspects of her divinity and power. Similar but much briefer invocations of Isis occur in Apuleius, *Metam.* xi. 5, P. Leyden U ii, and P. Brit. Mus. 121. 492-504, and the magical papyri contain numerous invocations of Hermes, who was sometimes regarded as the father of Isis, sometimes as her son (l. 39, note) or other kindred deities. 1380, however, is both earlier and on a higher level than the magical papyri, which mostly belong to the third or fourth centuries and

are of a more composite character, being largely concerned with spells. Since the papyrus itself dates from near the beginning of the second century, the composition of the invocation can hardly be placed later than in the first—a date supported by the evidence of some of the place-names, which suggest the period between Strabo and Ptolemy, contemporary with Pliny; cf. notes on ll. 21, 40, 70, 74, and 94. It is obviously based mainly on Egyptian documents such as those from which Brugsch (*Religion d. alt. Aeg.* 646–7; cf. Budge, *Osiris and the Egyptian Resurrection*, ii. 276–8) collected the Egyptian titles of Isis, and resembles the hymns to Osiris in the *Book of the Dead*. A demotic papyrus at Cairo (Spiegelberg, *Catal.* no. 31169) contains a short list of the titles of Isis with those of other gods, preceded by a list of Delta towns. But though the Egyptian elements are strongly marked both in the general arrangement and many of the individual expressions, the invocation was no doubt composed in Greek, as is shown by the identification of Isis with e.g. Hellas (l. 95), φρόνησις (l. 44), and many Greek or non-Egyptian deities, the introduction of the Hellenic scheme of the universe with Olympus (l. 130), Lethe (l. 127), and the Dioscuri (l. 235), and the numerous parallels to Greek inscriptions and other evidence for Isis-worship in the eastern Mediterranean. As an important document written by an initiate, it ranks with the well-known inscriptions of Ios and Andros (C. I. G. xii. v, nos. 14 and 739; cf. Diod. i. 27), in which Isis speaks in the first person. When complete it must have been of considerable length, for the writing on the verso proceeds in the opposite direction to that on the recto, and while not much need be lost at the end of 1380, since 1381. i, though not the actual beginning, is certainly not far from it, there is reason to think that many columns preceded 1380. i, for most of 1381 is the prelude to a narrative which only begins in l. 222 shortly before the papyrus breaks off. The list of Egyptian places which occupies 1380. 1–76 only covers the Delta, but the towns of Upper Egypt on the same scale would not have taken up more than the three or four preceding columns, and what preceded these is unknown. Isis-worship appealed to the Greeks and Romans much more than any other branch of the Egyptian religion and, in addition to the account of Isis in Diod. i. 11–27, Plutarch's treatise *De Iside et Osiride*, Apuleius, *Metam.* xi, and other literary testimony, the archaeological evidence from statues, inscriptions, gems, coins, &c., is extensive; cf. Drexler in Roscher, *Lex. d. griech. u. röm. Mythol.* ii. 373–548, Lafaye, *Hist. du culte des divinités d'Alexandrie hors de l'Égypte*.

The various aspects under which Isis is regarded in 1380 may be classified under the following heads. First as to her name, Ἴσις occurs in l. 23 and often; more mysterious names ending in -εῦ and resembling those found in magical papyri apparently occur in ll. 282, 286, and 296. Of her appellations derived

from the Egyptian Ἐσερέμφις (l. 46) is known from the recently discovered Theadelphia inscription, while Θανῆστις in l. 68, Μούχις(?) in l. 45, Ὀνε[in l. 1,]αθροῦχις in l. 14, Ταχνηψις in l. 75, and]χμεῦνις in l. 3 are new and may be compared to the titles Ἴσις Νεφρέμμις and Νεφορσῆς at Socnopaei Nesus. In places outside Egypt the titles Θαψ[ε?]ῶσις in l. 105 (among the Magi), Σαρκοῦνις in l. 119 (at Susa on the 'Red Sea'), Τ[.]β[ι]α and Παλέντρα(?) in ll. 114-15 (Troad and Dindyma) are also probably foreign appellations like the Egyptian rather than names of distinct divinities. The remarkable titles Λατίνα in l. 104 (Persia), and Ἑλλάς in l. 95 (Stratonos Pyrgos) testify to the strong hold which Isis-worship had taken upon the Graeco-Roman world. The syncretistic tendency of the age is well shown by the identification of Isis with various Graeco-Egyptian and foreign divinities, Aphrodite (i. e. Hathor) in l. 9 and often, Artemis in l. 84, Astarte in l. 116, Atargatis, a Syrian deity, in l. 100, Athena (i. e. Neith) in ll. 30 and 72, Bubastis in l. 4, Core in ll. 72 and 105, Dictynnis, a Cretan deity, in l. 82, Hecate in l. 113 (cf. ll. 84 τριφυῆς, 91 τριοδίτις, and the references to the underworld in ll. 127 and perhaps 164), Helen in l. 112, Hera in l. 26 and often, Hestia in ll. 23 and 73, Io Sothis in ll. 143-4 (cf. l. 64, where she is also connected with Io in an obscure passage), Leto in l. 79, Maia in ll. 39, 42, 103, and 116, Nanai, an old Babylonian goddess, in l. 106, Praxidice in l. 50, and Themis in l. 83. Several of these identifications were known, but those with Artemis, Helen, Hestia, Leto, Maia, and the last two appear to be new.

Isis as πολύμορφος (ll. 9 and 70) was worshipped as a kind of combination of the divine, human, and animal elements. She is called θεός in ll. 77 and 107, θεά in l. 130, δία in ll. 26, 86, and 111, ἱερά in ll. 18, 41, 110, ἀγία in ll. 34, 36, 89, ἀγνή in l. 86, ἀμίαντος in l. 109, ἀβίβαστος in l. 115, τελεία in l. 32. The forms under which she often appears in art, as a cow, serpent, or with a vulture head-dress and wings, the symbol of motherhood, are illustrated by the titles in ll. 126-7 θεῶν πάντων τὸ καλὸν ζῶον, l. 107 ταυρῶπις, l. 58 ἀσπίς, l. 66 γυπόμορφος; cf. the mention of her wings in ll. 219-20 and the institution of animal-worship ascribed to her in ll. 139-42, and ll. 159-63. The ordinary representations of her as a beautiful and youthful woman are indicated by the terms νέα in l. 85, νύμφη in l. 30, ὡραία in l. 90, καλλίμορφος in l. 54, καλλίστη in l. 100, χαριτόμορφος in l. 59. With regard to her power she is called παντοκράτειρα in l. 20, πάντων δεσπότις in l. 231, δεσπότις in l. 108, κρατίστη in l. 96, μεγίστη θεῶν in l. 142, μεγίστη in ll. 21, 92, and perhaps 66, μεγάλη in l. 77. As queen and ruler she appears as ἄνασσα τῆς οἰκουμένης in l. 121, ἄνασσα πόλεων in l. 57, and often as ἄνασσα simply, βασίλισσα in ll. 36 and 218, δυνάστις in ll. 34, 41, 57, and 97, κυρία πάσης χώρας in l. 24. As a warrior-goddess she is called στρατία in ll. 71, 83, 102, ἡγεμονίς in l. 52 (cf. l. 193)

στολαρχίς in l. 8, νικήτρια in ll. 30 and 48, ταχυνίκης in l. 69; cf. ll. 239-42, where she is said to overthrow tyrants, and l. 80 ἐλευθερία.

Of Isis as law-giver fifteen θεσμοί are alluded to in ll. 119-20 and two προστάγματα in ll. 155-7. Her foundation of νόμιμα is described in ll. 203-5 and of θρήσκια in ll. 244-5. As saviour or benefactress she is called σώτειρα in ll. 91 and 293, ἀνδροσώτειρα in l. 55, σώζουσα in l. 76, δότειρα in ll. 13 and 68, χαριτοδότειρα in l. 10, ἀρίστη in l. 99, ἀγαθή in ll. 51, 59, 95, ἡπία in ll. 11 and 86 (cf. l. 155), πρόνοια in l. 43; cf. ll. 155-7 and 246-7. ὀρθωσία in ll. 39 and 98 probably refers to help in childbirth. Her son Horus is εὐεργέτης καὶ ἀγαθός (ll. 246-7). Her identification with Abundance and Fortune is referred to in ll. 51 τύχη, 88 πανάφθονος, 99 εὐπλέα, 134-5 τῶν τὰς καλὰς ἀγόντων ἡμέρας εὐθημία. Increase and decay were regulated by her (ll. 174-7, 194-6). In particular she was the goddess of seas and rivers and protectress of sailors and travellers, as is shown by ll. 61 πελάγους κυρία, 69 κυβερνήτης, 15 and 74 ὀρμίστρια; cf. the more detailed description in ll. 121-3. The Nile was her special charge (ll. 125-6), with which river are coupled in ll. 222-6 the Eleutherus and Ganges. As champion and model of the female sex she is said in ll. 214-16 to have given women power equal to that of men, and in ll. 129-32 to be ἐν Ὀλύμπῳ θεὰ εὐπρεπῆς, κόσμος θηλειῶν καὶ φιλόστοργος (cf. l. 12), providing sweetness in assemblies. She was the goddess of truth (l. 63 ἀλήθεια) and love (ll. 109 ἀγάπη θεῶν, 28 ἀγάπ[η], 94 φιλία, 137 μισεχθής). The sorrows of Isis are well known, but in 1380 she is rather the goddess of joy, as is shown by her titles εὐφροσύνη in ll. 19 and 31, ἐν Λήθῃ ἰλαρὰ ὄψις in ll. 127-8, and by the gladness which she affords to the gods and her votaries (ll. 131-5, 157-9, 161-3, and 178-9). The invention, jointly with Hermes, of demotic writing, which is claimed by Isis in the Ios Inscr. 6-8, is alluded to in the title γραμματική in ll. 48 and 123, and λογιστική in ll. 27 and 124 perhaps refers to the discovery of arithmetic. She is also credited with the invention of weaving (ll. 145-6) and wine (ll. 179-83); cf. the more general phrases ἐπίνοια in ll. 34 and 60, φρόνησις in l. 44, φρονίμη in ll. 117 and 124, κεδνή in l. 79, εὐρέτρια in l. 81, and the account of Isis as εὐρέτρια πάντων in ll. 183-6. She is identified with the moon (l. 104), and the sun (ἡλίου ὄνομα in l. 112); cf. ll. 157-9, where she is said to bring the sun, and 221-2 and 232-4, two mutilated passages referring to Horus in connexion with the sun. With the stars she is connected in ll. 159-61 and in l. 235, where the Dioscuri are mentioned; cf. Io Sothis in ll. 143-4. The institution of the year of 365 days seems to be ascribed to her (ll. 153-5 and 204-5). As goddess of the sky (ll. 144-5) and light (ll. 248-9, 295), she regulated winds, lightning, snow, rain, and especially dew (ll. 172-4, 227-30, 237-9). A curious phrase πιστοτάσπις ἀνέμον καὶ ζῶης διάδημα (ll. 138-9; cf. ll. 193-4) is perhaps derived from the Egyptian, like ἐν ταῖς πανηγύρεσι βόστρυχος in l. 133 and τῶν

θεῶν Ἀρποκράτις in ll. 135-6. She was especially the goddess of immortality (l. 13), which she conferred upon her husband and brother Osiris (ll. 242-3) and her son Horus (ll. 246-7). Her recovery and burial of the former are mentioned in ll. 186-9, and her appointment of Horus as successor of Osiris in ll. 209-14, 250-2, and 263-8. As the goddess of mysteries she is called μύστις (l. 111) and χρησμοφδός (l. 43), and is seen by her votaries (ll. 152-3). Temples of Isis were appointed by her in all cities (ll. 202-3), as is illustrated not only by ll. 1-119, but by special references to shrines or ceremonies at Busiris (ll. 269-71), Ὀσίριδος ἄδυτον (ll. 161-3), Memphis (249), Heracleopolis (150-2), Abydos (l. 278), and an unknown town Η[.]κτος (ll. 148-9). In the processions (ἐξοδαίαι) of the gods she took the chief part (ll. 136-7), being leader of the muses (ll. 62 and 128). She was all-seeing (παντόπ[τις] in l. 93, κατόπτις in l. 87, πολυόφθαλμος in l. 129). Other noteworthy titles, most of which are new as applied to Isis, are τὸ ἄνω in ll. 38 and 42, ἀπάτειρα in l. 19, ἄφεις ἐφόδων in l. 80, λωτοφόρος in l. 40, μίαι in l. 6, πρῶτον ὄνομα in l. 143, and στείχουσα in l. 87. Uncertain titles occur in ll. 7, 17, 25-9, 31, and 47, and much of the last four columns is obscure, Col. xii having only the beginnings of lines.

The detailed list of places in which Isis was worshipped naturally adds much to the extant evidence on the subject (cf. Wiedemann, *Herodots zweites Buch*, 190, Lanzone, *Diz. di mitol. egiz.* 813), and incidentally provides some valuable geographical information concerning the Delta, since the grouping of the places is more or less systematic. The section dealing with Upper Egypt is almost entirely lost, the first place mentioned being Aphroditopolis (l. 1) or some other town in the vicinity of Memphis, which in l. 2 is called by its old Egyptian name 'the House of Hephaestus' (Ptah). Proceeding northward along the main western branch of the Nile past Letopolis (l. 6) and the Prosopite nome (l. 8) to Naucratis (l. 19) and the Gynaecopolite nome (l. 21), the list turns eastward to Buto (l. 27), the Saïte nome (ll. 30-2), and the northern part of the central Delta (ll. 33-7), then southwards to Bubastus (l. 37), Heliopolis (l. 38), and Athribis (l. 39). Again proceeding northward through the Phthemphuthite nome (l. 40) to Xoïs (l. 42), the list then shifts across to places in the Libyan nome far west of Alexandria (ll. 43-5), then back to Phagroriopolis in the eastern Delta (l. 46) and other places in that quarter up to Tanis (l. 59). The coast east and west of Alexandria occupies ll. 60-73, Pelusium and the extreme north-east ll. 73-6, after which the list turns to places outside Egypt. Besides a few nomes, about sixty-seven Delta towns are mentioned, including most of those found in Strabo or Ptolemy and several which were only known from Stephanus Byzantinus or the Geographus Ravennas and can now be located more definitely (ll. 15 Psochemis, 16 Mylon, 41 Teouchis, 69 Peucestis), and several that were previously

unknown (ll. 11 Calamisis and Carene, 13 Hierasus, 17 Ce...culemis (?), 22 Pephremis (= Papremis?), 31 Caene, 40 Hiera, 47 Choatine, 54 Isidium, 64 Meniouis, 70 Melais, 71 Menouphis; cf. ll. 4, 25, 31, and 66 where the names are new but uncertain). Alexandria is not mentioned, though a great Isis-temple there is known from 35 recto. 13. Perhaps the metropolis is accounted for by the mention of 'the Island', if that of Pharos is meant (l. 68, note), or it occurred without regard to its geographical position at the beginning of the list, which may, however, well have begun with Philae, or possibly the list was based on an ancient Egyptian one made before Alexandria was founded.

The fifty-five places outside Egypt are naturally for the most part familiar, and are arranged with less regard to geography. Beginning in l. 77 with Arabia, Asia Minor (ll. 78-81), Cyrene, Crete, Chalcedon, and Rome (ll. 81-3), Aegean islands (ll. 84-5), Cyprus (ll. 86-9) and some other places which for various reasons cannot be located with certainty (ll. 89-92; Hypsele in l. 92 is unknown), the list goes back to the frontier of Egypt and Palestine and mentions several towns on or near the Syrian coast (ll. 93-9; Sinope in l. 96 is out of place here). Then come Delphi (l. 99) and a rather mixed series of towns and countries including the Amazons (l. 102), India (l. 103), Persia (ll. 104-6), and Italy (l. 109), the Hellespont and coast of the Aegean (ll. 110-15), Syria again (ll. 116-17), and finally an unknown Susa on the 'Red Sea' (ll. 118-19).

Altogether the papyrus, in spite of its imperfect condition, supplies a fairly comprehensive and vivid picture of Isis-worship in the first century when that Graeco-Egyptian cult had become a world-force. It is an intentionally archaic kind of composition, as is clear on comparison with 1381, which, though also a composition in praise of a Graeco-Egyptian deity and professing to be concerned primarily with the translation of a hieroglyphic roll, is much more Greek than Egyptian in character and style, illustrating the rapid decline of ancient Egyptian influences, even in matters of religion, under the Romans. The author of 1380 was no doubt a priest of Isis, possibly at Oxyrhynchus, where Isis had a separate temple (43 verso. ii. 16), but more probably at Memphis, which not only is dignified by an unusual name in l. 2 (cf. p. 203), and singled out in l. 249, but affords a connecting link with the text on the verso; cf. 1381, introd.

In the text the high stops represent those in the original, the commas are inserted by us. For assistance in connexion with the ancient Egyptian evidence concerning Isis and Imhotep-Asclepius we are indebted to Mr. F. Ll. Griffith and with regard to Alexandrian coins to Mr. J. G. Milne.

Col. i.

[τὴν ἐν Ἀφροδίτης ?] πόλει Ὀνε-
 [. τὴν ἐν τῷ] Ἐφαίστου οἴκῳ
 [14 letters] χμεῦνιν· τὴν
 [ἐν 12 letters]όφει Βούβασ-
 5 [τιν, κ]αλουμένην· τὴν
 [ἐν Δητ]οῦς [π]ό[λε]ι [τῆ] μεγάλη μίαν,
 [.]ιον· τὴν ἐν Ἀφροδίτης πό-
 [λει τοῦ Προσωπ[ί]του στολαρχεί-
 [δα,] πολύμορφον, Ἀφροδίτην· τὴν
 10 [ἐ]πὶ τοῦ Δέλτα χαριτοδώτειραν·
 [ἐ]ν Καλαμίσι ἠπίαν· ἐν τῇ Καρή-
 [ν]η φιλόστοργον· ἐν τῇ Νεικίου
 [ἀ]θάνα(το)ν, δότειραν· ἐν τῷ Ἰεράσῳ
 [.]αθροῖχιν· ἐν Μωμέμ-
 15 [φι ἀνασ]σαν· ἐν Ψωχήμει [δ]ορμισ-
 [τριαν]· ἐν Μύλωνι ἀνασ[σα]ν· τὴν
 [ἐν] Κε . . κυλήμει [. .]την· τὴν ἐν
 [Ἐρ]μοῦ πόλει καλλιμόρφον, ἱεράν·
 [τὴν] ἐν Ναυκράτει ἀπάτειραν, εὐφρο-
 20 [σύ]νην, σώτειραν, παντοκράτειραν,
 [μ]εγίστην· ἐν Ν[ι]θίνῃ τοῦ Γυναικο-
 [πο]λείτου Ἀφροδείτην· ἐν Πεφρή-
 [μι] Ἰσιν, ἀνασσαν, Ἐστίαν, [[ανασσαν]]
 [κυ]ρείαν πάσης χώρας· [[τὴν ἐν Χνου]]

Col. ii.

25 τὴν ἐν Ἐσ[.]· [.]ν,
 Ἐραν, διά[ν,]ν[.] ἐν
 Βουτῷ λο[γιστικῆν,] ἐν
 Θῶνι ἀγάπ[ην]ω χρο-
 νῶ καὶ ἀγῶ[.]ην· ἐν
 30 τῷ Σαίτη ν[ι]κήτ[ριαν, Ἀ]θήνην, νύμφην·
 ἐν Νηβεο[.]· [. . .]ν· ἐν Καινῇ εὐ-
 φροσύνην· ἐν Σαί Ἐραν, ἀνασ(σ)αν, τε-
 λείαν[.] ἐν Ἰ[σειῶ] Ἰσ[ιν]· ἐν Σεβεννύ-
 τῳ ἐπί[νο]ιαν, δυ[νάστ]ιν, Ἐραν, ἀ-
 35 γίαν[.] ἐ[ν] Ἐ[ρ]μοῦ πόλει Ἀφρο[δ]εῖτην,
 βασ[ί]λεισ[σαν, ἀγε]ίαν· ἐν Δειδὸς π[ό]-
 λει τῇ μεικ[ρᾶ] ἀνασ(σ)αν· ἐν Βουβά-
 στω τὸ ἄνω· ἐν Ἡλίου π[ό]λει Ἀφρο-
 δίτην· ἐν Ἀ[θ]ρίβ[ι] Μαῖαν, ὀρθωσίαν· ἐν
 40 Ἰερά Φθεμφ[θ]ού[τ]ου λω[τ]οφόρον· ἐν
 Τεούχι ἱεράν, δυναστειν· ἐν τοῖς
 Βουκολεῦσι Μα[ί]αν· ἐν Ξοῖ τ[ὸ] ἄνω,
 χρησμοδό[ν]· ἐν Καταβαθμῷ πρ[ό]-
 νοιαν· ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἀπεως φρόνησιν[.]
 45 ἐπὶ Λευκῆς Ἀκτῆς Ἀφροδείτην, Μοῦ-
 χιν, Ἐσερέμφ[ι]ν· ἐν Φραγοῦρων πό-
 λει[.]φιν[.] ἐν Χοατεῖνῃ

3. μ of χμεῦνιν above the line. 10. ι of [ε]πι and χαρι- above ει deleted. 1. χαριτοδώτειραν.
 11. First ι of καλαμισι above ει deleted. 13. τ of δοτειραν corr. from ρ. 15. ι of [ο]ρμισ[τριαν] above
 ει deleted. 21. θι of ν[ι]θινη above the line. 23. ἴσιν Π. ι of εστian above ει deleted. 30. ω of
 τω above the line (?). 34. ι of δυ[ναστ]ιν above ει deleted. 34-5. ι of αγian above ει (deleted?).
 39. β[ι] of α[θ]ριβ[ι] above the line, and αι of μαιαν above ε (deleted?).

Col. iii.

νικητήτριαν· ἐν γ]ραμ-
 ματε[ικ]ή[ν,] ἐν Κυνὸς πόλει
 50 τοῦ Βου[σε]ν[ι]τ[ου] Πραξ[ι]δ[ι]κ[η]ν·

Col. iv.

70 βερνήτην· ἐν Μελαίδι πολύμορ-
 φον· ἐν Μ[ε]νοῦφι στρ[α]τίαν· ἐν
 Μετηλείτῃ Κ[ό]ρην· ἐπὶ Χάρακος [Α-

ἐν Βουσίρει τύχην, ἀγαθήν· ἐν
 Ἑρμοῦ π[ό]λε[ι] τοῦ Μενδησίου ἡ-
 γεμονί[δ]α· ἐν Φαρβαίθω καλ-
 λίμορφ[ο]ν· ἐν τῷ Ἰσιδίῳ τοῦ Σε-
 55 θροῖτου ἀνδρασώτειραν· ἐν
 Ἡρακλέ[ους] πόλει τοῦ Σεθροῖτου
 δυνάστι[ν]· ἐν Φερνο[ύ]φι ἀνασσαν
 πόλεων[·] ἐν Λε[ο]ντοπόλει ἀσ-
 πίδα, ἀγ[α]θήν· ἐν Τάνι χαρειτό-
 60 μορφον, Ἡρ[α]ν· ἐπὶ Σχεδίας ἐπί-
 νοιαν· ἐπὶ τ[ο]ῦ Ἡρακλίου πελάγους
 κυρείαν[·] ἐ[ν] Κανώβω μουσανα-
 γωγόν· ἐν Μεν[ο]ύθι ἀλήθιαν· [ἐ]ν
 Μεν[ι]οῦει Ἰοῦς ἢ κτίξεται π[. . .].
 65 [·]μερεί[α]ς προκαθημέν[η]ν· ἐπὶ τοῦ
 Μ[·]νεστίου μεγίστου γυπόμορ-
 φον, Ἀφροδ[εῖ]την· ἐν Ταποσίρι
 Θαυῆστιν, Ἡρ[α]ν, δώτειραν· ἐν τῇ Νή-
 σφ ταχυ[ι]κην· ἐν Πευκεστίδι κυ-

θήνην· ἐν Πλινθίνῃ Ἑστίαν· ἐν [·]
 Πηλουσίῳ ὀρμίστριαν· ἐπὶ τοῦ
 75 Κασίου Ταχνηψιν· ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἑκ-
 {κ}ρή(γ)ματο[ς] Ἰσιν, σώζουσαν· ἐν τῇ
 Ἀραβία μεγάλην, θεόν· ἐν τῇ [Νή-
 σφ ἱερωνικοτελοῦσαν· ἐν Λυκία
 Λητώ· ἐν Μύροις τῆς Λυκίας κεδνήν,
 80 ἐλευθε[ρί]αν· ἐν Κνίδῳ ἄφειν ἐφ[ό]-
 δων, εὐ[ρ]έτριαν· ἐν Κυρήνῃ Ἰσιν·
 ἐν Κρήτῃ Δικτυννίν· ἐν Χαλκη[δ]ό-
 νι Θέμιν· ἐν Ῥώμῃ στρατίαν· ἐν
 ταῖς Κυκλά[σ]ι νήσοις τριφυήν, Ἀρ-
 85 τεμειν· ἐν [Π]άθμω νέα, μ . [·]ιθ[·] . -
 κη· ἐν Πάφῳ ἀγνήν, δία, ἠπία[·] ἐν
 Χίῳ στ[ί]χουσαν· ἐν Σαλαμείνι κα-
 τόπτω· ἐν Κύπρῳ πανάφθο-
 ν[ο]ν· ἐν τῇ Χαλκιδικῇ [ἀ]γίαν· ἐν
 90 τῇ Πιερί[α] ὠραίαν[·] ἐν τῇ Ἀσ[ε]ία [·]
 τριοδεῖτιν· ἐπὶ τῆς Πέτρας σώ-
 τειραν· ἐν Ὑψήλῃ μεγίστην·

54-5. σεθροῖτου Π.
 κυβερνητικὴν above εἰ deleted.
 80. ε of εφ[ο]δων rewritten.

58. 1. Λεοντοπόλει ὀρμίστριαν.
 73. ι of εστίαν above εἰ deleted.
 85-6. 1. νέα, . . . κην . . . δία, ἠπία.

68. 1. δώτειραν. 69-70. ι of
 76. ἴσιν Π. 78. ἱερωνικ. Π. 1. ἱερονικ.

Col. v.

ἐν Ῥεινοκορούλοις παντόπ[τιν]
 ἐν Δώροις φιλίαν· ἐν Στρ[ά]τω[ν]ος
 95 Πύργῳ Ἑλλάδα, ἀγαθήν[·] ἐν
 Ἀσκάλῳ κρατίστην· ἐν Σινώ-
 πῃ πολυώνυμον· ἐν Ῥαφέα δυ-
 νάστιν· ἐν Τριπόλει ὀρθωσίαν· ἐν
 Γάζῃ εὐπλέαν· ἐν Δελφοῖς ἀρίσ-
 100 {σ}την, καλλίστην· ἐν Βανβύκῃ Ἀ-
 ταργάτει· ἐν Θραξί [κ]άν Δήλῳ πο-
 λυώνυμον· ἐν Ἀμάξοις στρατί-

Col. vi.

τάρτην· ἐν Πτολεμαίδι φρονίμ[η]ν·
 ἐν Σούσοις τῆς κατὰ τὴν Ἐρυθρ[ά]ν θά-
 λασσαν Σαρκοῦνιν[·] ἢ καὶ ἐν τοῖ[ς] δε-
 120 κάπαντι θεσμοῖς ἐρμηνεύεις πρώτ[ισ]τα
 ἀνασσα τῆς οἰκουμένης· ἐπίτρο-
 πον καὶ ὀδηγὸν θαλασ[σ]ίων καὶ ποτα-
 μίων στομάτων κυρίαν· γραμμα-
 τεικὴν, λογιστικὴν, φρονίμ[η]ν·
 125 τὴν καὶ τὸν Νίλον ἐπὶ π[ᾶ]σαν χώραν
 ἐπανάγουσαν[·] θεῶν πάντων τὸ

αν· ἐν Ἰνδοῖς Μαῖαν· ἐν Θεσσαλοῖς
σελήνην· ἐν Πέρσαις Λατείνην· ἐν
105 Μάτοις Κόρην, Θαψ[ε?]ῦσιν· ἐν Σού-
σοις Ναγίαν· ἐν Φοίνικι Συρ[[ε]]ίας
θεός· ἐν Σαμοθράκη ταυρῶπις·
ἐν Περγάμφ δεσπότις· ἐ[ν] Πόντῳ
ἀμμαντος· ἐν Ἰταλία ἀ[γά]πην θε-
110 ῶν· ἐν Σάμφ ἱεράν· ἐν Ἑλλη[σπ]όρ-
τῳ μύστειν· ἐ[ν] Μύνδῳ δ[ί]α[ν]· ἐν
Βειθυνεία Ἑλένην· ἐν Τ[ε]νέδῳ ἡ-
λίου ὄνομα· ἐν Καρία Ἐκά[τ]η· ἐν
Τρωάδι κὰν Δινδύμη Τ[.]β[ι]αν,
115 Παλέντρα[ν], ἀβείβαστρο[ν], Ἰσ[τ]ιν·
ἐν Βηρυτῶ Μεαν· ἐν Σεῖδῶνι Ἀσ-

καλὸν ζῶον· τὴν ἐν Α[θή]θῃ ἰλα-
ρὰν ὄψιν· τὴν μουσαναγωγόν·
τὸν πολ[ο]υόφθαλμ[ο]ν[.] τὴν ἐν
130 Ὀλύμπῳ θεὰν εὐπρ[ε]πήν[.] κόσμον
θηλειῶν καὶ φιλόστ[ορ]γον[.] τὴν ἐν
ταῖς συνόδοις ἡδίας εὐπορίαν·
τὴν ἐν ταῖς πανη[γ]ύρεσιν βό[σ]τρυ-
χον· τῶν τὰς καλὰς ἀγόντων
135 ἡμ[έ]ρας εὐθηναίαν[.] τὴν τῶν θεῶν
Ἀρποκράτιν· τὴν ἐν ταῖς τῶν θεῶν
ἐξοδίαις πάνταρχον, μισεχθ[ή]ν·
πιστοῖασπιν ἀνέμου καὶ ζῶι-
ῆς διάδημα· ἐξ ἧς αἰ εἰκόνε[ς] κα[ὶ]
140 τὰ ζῶα πάντων τῶν θεῶν τ[οῦ]

102. l. Ἀμαζόσι. 103. Ἰνδοῖς Π. αἰ of μαῖαν above ε deleted. 104. Above ε of περσαις α (?) deleted.
105. l. Μάγοις. θ of θαψ[ε]υσιν corr. from τ (?). 106. ι of ναγίαν above ε deleted.
107. θεος. Π.; l. θεόν, . . . ταυρῶπιν. 108. l. δεσπότιν. 109. ι of ἀμμαντος. above εἰ deleted; l. -τον.
111. ν of μυνδῳ corr. 113. l. Ἐκα[τ]ην. 116. l. Μαῖαν. 120. ι of -παντι above εἰ deleted.
l. δεκάπεντε. εἰς of ἐρμηνευεῖς above the line. 124. First ι of λογιστικην above εἰ deleted. 129. l. τὴν
for τον. 130. l. Ὀλύμφ. 137. ι of μισεχθ[ή]ν above εἰ (?).

Col. vii.

ὀνόματος σοῦ λ . ρατιαπρ[.]
as ἔχοντα προσκυνῖται[.] κ[ν]ρ[ί]α Ἰσι, μ[ε]-
γίστη θεῶν, πρῶτον ὄνομα, Ἰοῖ
Σῶθι· τὸ μεταίωρον κρατεῖς κ[αὶ]
145 ἀμ[έ]τρητον[.] ἐ[πι]γοεῖς καὶ τὰ [.] ν[.] -
θῶτα ὑφῆναι· σὺ καὶ τὰς σῶα[ς] γυ-
ναῖκας ἀνδράσι συνορμισθ[ή]ναι
θέλις· οἱ πρέσβεις ἅπαντες ἐ[ν] Η[.] .
κτω θ[ύ]ουσι· νέαι ἅπασαι αἰ ε-
150 [.]σαι ἐν Ἡρακλέους πόλει φ[έ]ρον-
ται ἐπὶ σοῦ καὶ ἔκτισαν σοὶ τὴν
χώραν ὀρῶσι σὲ οἱ κατὰ τὸ πιστὸν
ἐπικαλούμενοι· ἐξ ὧν ἐ[.] δ[.] κατὰ ἀ-
ρετὴν τῶν συνεστηκυῶν ἡμε-

Col. viii.

165 γο[ν]ται[.] τὰ σα ὁ
μ . [.] . ογται· τὸ σοῦ [.]
τ[.] κασ . νουβαν δ[ι]α
[.] ρ . [.]ν· ἀπέδειξ[α]ς το . και
[.] [.]παν[.] [.]η
170 [.] καὶ τὴν γῆν σπορίμην
[.] ασα[.] ἅπαντα τὸν βίον
[.] . [.] . [.] πανταχῆ
τελ . . κ ἐπιγοῦσα τὴν δρό-
σον[.] καὶ τὰ . . . [.]μενα πάντα[.] καὶ
175 φθορὰν οἷς θέλις δίδοις, τοῖς δὲ
καθεφθαρμένοις αὐξήσιν δι-
δ[οις] καὶ ἅπαντα δ[ια]καθαίρεις·
πᾶσαν ἡμέραν τῇ εὐφροσύνη κα-

155 ῥῶν τξε· ἠπέια σοῦ καὶ εὐδιάλ-
 λακτος ἢ χάρις τῶν δ[ύ]ο προσ-
 ταγμάτων[·] ἠλίον ἀπ' ἀνατολῆς
 μέχρι δύσεως σὺ ἐπιφέρει[ι]ς κ[αί] ὅλοι
 εὐφραίνοντα[ι οἱ] θεοί· ἄστρω[ν] ἀ-
 160 νατολαῖς σὲ ἀκάματοι προσκυνοῦσιν
 οἱ ἐπιχώριοι καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἱερά ζῶ-
 α ἐν τῷ Ὀσίριδος ἀδύτῳ, ἰλαροὶ γεί-
 νονται ὅταν σέ[[ν]] ὀνομάσωσιν·
 οἱ . [.] δ[α]ίμονες ὑπήκοοι σοὶ [γ]ί-

τ[έ]διξας· σὺ κ[·] . [·]α[·] . α εὐρούσα
 180 οἴνου πᾶν τὸ . [·] . [·]α[·] παρέσχε[ς] [[· .]]
 πρῶτον ἐν ταῖς τῶν θεῶν πα-
 νηγύρισιν ἐπ . . . [·]τρα καὶ εὐ-
 χεαῖς καὶ ἐπικαῖν . . [· .] σὺ πάντων
 ὑγρῶν καὶ ξηρῶν καὶ ψ[υχ]ρῶν· ἐξ ὧν
 185 ἅπαντα συνέστηκεν[·] εὐρέτρια
 π[ά]ντων ἐγενήθη[ς] σὺ τὸν ἀδελ-
 φόν σο[υ] ἐπα[ν]ή[γ]αγες μόνη κυβερ-
 νήσασα καλῶς καὶ εὐαρμόστως
 θάψασα[·] σὺ τοῦ ἀγ[α]θοῦ δαίμονος

142. μ of μ[ε]γιστη above οἱ (?) deleted. 143. ἴοι Π. 144. l. μετέωρον. 145. Second ε of
 ε[πι]νοεῖς above the line. 146-7. κα of γυ[ν]αικας corr. 151. υ of ἐπι and ἐκτισαν above εἰ deleted.
 152. ρ of ὀρωσι above π deleted and ι above the line. 153. δ (or δ[·]) above the line. 161. ἱερα Π.
 164. ὑπηκοοι Π. 176. l. κατεφθαρμένοις. 181. l. πανηγύρεσιν. 182. ο of]τοα above ρ deleted.
 182-3. l. εὐχαῖς (?). 184. ν of ψ[υχ]ρῶν above the line.

Col. ix.

190 κ . [.]
 σι[·]] . υ . ρ[·]
 α . [.] πόλει κα[·] . [.] .
 κ[·] . [.] ἠύξησας· ἠ[γ]ε-
 μ[ο]νίς διαδημάτων· αὐ[ξ]ήσε[ω]ς
 195 καὶ φθορᾶς κα[ι] . . .]ήσεως κ[αί] . [.] . ἠ[σε]- 220
 ως κυρία· σὺ τοῦ πα . . ν[·] . [.] τα-
 φῆς κ[·] .]αναγ . [. . .] . ια[·] σὺ [. . .] .
 αστω Ὀσίρι[·] . π . . . ν . [. . . .
 καὶ . . [. .] . . [.]τα ἐστιν ἐ[·]
 200 σας(·) σὺ τὰ πάντα . . . μ . . [. . . .
 καὶ τὰ πάντα πρὸς δια . ο . . [. .]ρ[·] . .
 σας· Ἰσεῖα πᾶσαι[ς] πόλεσιν εἰς τὸν [ἅπαν-
 τα χρόνον] κατ[έ]στ[η]σας· κ[αί] π[ᾶ]σιν
 τὰ νόμιμα κ[αί] ἐνιαυτὸν τέλι[ον] π[ᾶ]-
 205 ρέδωκας[·] κ[αί] . . .] . αφωνα πᾶσι ο . . . [.
 σε[·]ει[·] . α κ[ατὰ] ἅπαντα τόπον[·] ἐν
 πάντει τὸ π[·] . . .] ἐδιξας πρὸς τὸ ἰ-

Col. x.

ησας· κα[ι] ἐν τῷ] ἀδύτῳ η[·] . .]ονη-
 σας ἔθνη [15 letters]οραν
 αν[·] . s βασίλισσα ηρ . [·] . . υ[·] . .]νη
 κυρία
 π[ρ]οελούσα πᾶσαν χώραν [. . σ]οῦ
 τ[αί]ς πτέρυξι[ν]· υ . . . [·] . τ[·] . .]μον
 ἐστιν· τὸ κ[·]ρ[·] .] δ ὑφέστη[κε] . .] . ε ἠλίον
 Ὀρ[·] .] α[·] . . .]υτογ[·] σὺ τῆ[ς] γῆ[ς] κυρία
 α . ρ[·] . . . πλή]μμυραν ποταμῶν
 τ[·] . . [·] . [. . .]η ἄγεις· καὶ τοῦ ἐν Αἴ-
 225 γύπτῳ Νε[ί]λο]υ, ἐ[ν] δ[ὲ] Τριπόλι Ἐλευθέ-
 ρου, ἐν δὲ τῇ Ἰνδικῇ Γάγγου· καὶ {το}
 δι' ἣν τὸ πᾶν κ[αί] τ]δ ἐνκερ . . ν ἐστιν διὰ
 πάν-
 τος ὄμβρου καὶ πᾶ[σ]ης πηγῆς καὶ πᾶ-
 [ση]ς δρόσου κα[ι] χι[λ]όνος καὶ πᾶ-
 230 σης λ[·]σε[ω]ς κα[ι] γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης[·]
 σὺ καὶ πάντων δεσπότης Ἰσαεῖ·

δέξαι πάν[τας ἀ]νθρώπους ὅτι σὺ
 [.]αν . ουνα[. . .] . ἀρα σοῦ· σὺ τὸν υἱ-
 210 ὄν σ[ο]υ ὦρον Ἀπόλλωνα [[ν]] π[α]ντῆ κύρι-
 ον μέγαν τοῦ πά[ν]τος κόσμου καὶ
 ἀπ κ[. . . .] . ν [[πασαν]] [. . . τ]ῆν
 α λην [πᾶ]σαν· εἰς τὸν ἀπ[αντα]
 χρο-
 γον [κ]ατέστησας· σὺ γυναιξί[ν]
 215 ἴσην δύναμιν τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐ[ποί]-

τ . [.] . . ξ[.]ας πάντας τοῦ πῶλου
 τὸν . [.]εον ὦρον εἰς ἥλιον . [.] . [.] .
 . . [.]οτ[.]ν πλείον χῶραν πᾶν ὦρος[.]
 235 σ[ὺ] Διοσκού[ρ]ω . . ρ . ἐποίησας·
 σα[. . . .] κατα . ον[.] τροφῆς πᾶν
 . ο . [. . .]ρ[.]ων ἡῦξη[σα]ς· σὺ ἀνέμων
 κα[ὶ βρ]οντῶν καὶ ἀστραπῶν καὶ
 χεῖρῶν τὸ κράτος ἔχεις· σὺ στρα-
 240 τείας καὶ ἡγεμονίας κυρία τοὺς εὐ-
 κόπως διαφθείρεις πιστοῖς βου-
 λεύμασιν· σὺ τὸν μέγαν [Ὀ]σιριν
 ἀθάνατο[ν ἐποί]η[σ]α[ς] . [.

202. ἴση Π. ε of πολεσιν corr. from υ (?) and ε of εἰς above the line. 206. α of] . α above the line.
 208. ι of οτι above εἰ deleted. 213. ε of εἰς above the line. 215. ἴση Π. 218. αἰ in the margin.
]νη above the line. 221. ὑφεστη Π. ε before ἡλιον above the line. 226. ον of γαγγου corr.
 227. δι ην in the margin and το above the line. 232. υ πολου above five deleted letters. 237. ο of . ο . [above the line. 239-40. Second ε of εχεις and ε of στρατειας above the line.
 I. τοὺς (τυράνους); cf. p. 220. 241. ε of διαφθεις above the line in both cases.

Col. xi.

καὶ πάση χῶρα τ[.] . τ[.] πα-
 245 ρέδωκας θρήσκ[ι]α [.]
 ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ὦρον τ[.] . [. . .]ος εὐ-
 εργέτην γενάμε[νον] καὶ ἀγαθόν·
 σὺ κ[α]ὶ φωτὸς κα[ὶ] φλ[ε]γμάτων κυ-
 ρία· σὺ ἐν Μέμ[φ]ι . [.] . [.]ε[ι]ς [ἄ]δυτον·
 250 ὦρος προκρίνας ὅτ[ι] ἐ[ποί]ησας αὐ-
 τοῦ διάδοχον . α[. . .] . ξ[. . .] θρο-
 υιστής· χρησ[μ]φ[δ]ελλην
 τὰ ἐπιστρα[. . . .]τ[. . . .]ασιαί
 π[.]η[.]α[.]σαν·
 255 καὶ [. . . .]ι καὶ θ[. . .] κατὰ γεῖς τοῖς
 εἰ[.]ν . ἀπ[. . .]ξιν καὶ ἀγίαν·
 εὐ[. . . .]ν κατ[ἡ]ξήσας κράτος
 ε[.]τα αἰ [ἀ]βουλίας
 [.] . σασ . . . [.] κελεύουσα

Col. xii.

[
 [
 [
 275 κ[α]ὶ [
 τι τη[
 η τέρατα[.] ε . [
 ἱερῶ καὶ πολε[
 βυδον θύραν [
 280 σὺ ἡ κτίσασα ἐν [
 φάναντον κα[
 λε . εθεῦ· καὶ α[
 τὴν εὐθίαν τ[
 σὺ ἐκτίσας . . . [
 285 καὶ [ἐ]ν τῇ προσ[
 ταβδεῦ· σὺ δ[
 ο[

- 260 ἃ ἀνθ[. . . .] . ν τὰ ἀνάφορα πάν-
 τα τ[.]ομένων πάντων
 των κα[ι] πάντων 290 των . . [
 θεῶν κ[.] . . .]ας διάδοχον αὐτ[ὸ]ν ἐ-
 ποίησ[ας]· καὶ τὸν τ[.] . [.] . ρον [.] . [[. σασ]] εἰς
 265 βυ[.]τι[.] . . π[.]άν[τ]ων θρόνου κύρι-
 ον· καὶ χρησμοδὸν βασιλέα
 κατέ[σ]τησας ἐπὶ τοῦ πατρίου
 οἴκου εἰς τὸν ἀπ[αν]τα χρόνον·
 ἐπεὶ σο[φ]ῦ ἐκ τριῶν τὸ ἐν Βου-
 270 σείρι· ἰερὸν τὸ καλούμενον
 Β[.] . . . [.] . . . ου ἀν[.] . . . [.] . . .

250. ι of προκρινας above ει.

250-1. τ of αυτου corr. from δ.

269. 1. ἐπί.

296. ε of οιωεανεν above η (or κ?) deleted.

‘ . . . at Aphroditopolis One . . . ; in the House of Hephaestus . . . , . . chmeunis ; who at . . . ophis art called Bubastis, . . . ; at Letopolis Magna one, . . . ; at Aphroditopolis in the Prosopite nome fleet-commanding, many-shaped, Aphrodite ; at Delta giver of favours ; at Calamisis gentle ; at Carene affectionate ; at Niciu immortal, giver ; at Hierasus . . . athroichis ; at Momemphis ruler ; at Psochemis bringer to harbour ; at Mylon ruler ; at Ce . . culemis . . . ; at Hermopolis of beautiful form, sacred ; at Naucratis fatherless, joy, saviour, almighty, most great ; at Nithine in the Gynaecopolite nome Aphrodite ; at Pephremis Isis, ruler, Hestia, lady of every country ; at Es . . . Hera, divine ; at . . . ; at Buto skilled in calculation, . . . ; at Thonis love . . . ; in the Saïte nome victorious, Athena, nymph ; at Nebeo . . . ; at Caene joy ; at Saïs Hera, ruler, perfect ; at Iseum Isis ; at Sebennytus inventiveness, mistress, Hera, holy ; at Hermopolis Aphrodite, queen, holy ; at Diospolis Parva ruler ; at Bubastus of old ; at Heliopolis Aphrodite ; at Athribis Maia, supporter ; at Hieria in the Phthemphuthite nome lotus-bearing ; at Teouchis sacred, mistress ; among the Bucoli Maia ; at Xoïs of old, oracular ; at Catabathmus providence ; at Apis understanding ; at Leuce Acte Aphrodite, Mouchis, Eseremphis ; at Phagroriopolis . . . ; at Choatine victorious ; at . . . skilled in writing, . . . ; at Cynopolis in the Busirite nome Praxidice ; at Busiris fortune, good ; at Hermopolis in the Mendesian nome leader ; at Pharbaethus of beautiful form ; at Isidium in the Sethroïte nome saviour of men ; at Heracleopolis in the Sethroïte nome mistress ; at Phernouphis ruler of cities ; at Leontopolis serpent, good ; at Tanis of gracious form, Hera ; at Schedia inventiveness ; at Heracleum lady of the sea ; at Canopus leader of the muses ; at Menouthis truth ; at Meniouis seated before Io in whose honour . . . is founded ; at M . . enestium most great, vulture-shaped, Aphrodite ; at Taposiris Thauestis, Hera, giver ; in the Island swiftly-victorious ; at Peucestis pilot ; at Melai’s (?) many-formed ; at Menouphis warlike ; in the Metelite nome Core ; at Charax Athena ; at Plinthine Hestia ; at Pelusium bringer to harbour ; in the Casian district Tachnepsis ; at the Outlet Isis, preserver ; in Arabia great, goddess ; in the Island giver of victory in the sacred games ; in Lycia Leto ; at Myra in Lycia sage, freedom ; at Cnidus dispeller of attack, discoverer ; at Cyrene Isis ; in Crete Dictynnis ; at Chalcedon Themis ; at Rome warlike ; in the Cyclades islands of threefold nature,

Artemis ; at Patmos young, . . . ; at Paphos hallowed, divine, gentle ; in Chios marching ; at Salamis observer ; in Cyprus all-bounteous ; in Chalcidice holy ; in Pieria youthful ; in Asia worshipped at the three ways ; at Petra saviour ; at Hypsele most great ; at Rhinocolura all-seeing ; at Dora friendship ; at Stratonos Pyrgos Hellas, good ; at Ascalon mightiest ; at Sinope many-named ; at Raphia mistress ; at Tripolis supporter ; at Gaza abundant ; at Delphi best, fairest ; at Bambyce Atargatis ; among the Thracians and in Delos many-named ; among the Amazons warlike ; among the Indians Maia ; among the Thessalians moon ; among the Persians Latina ; among the Magi Core, Thapseusis ; at Susa Nania ; in Syrophoenicia goddess ; in Samothrace bull-faced ; at Pergamum mistress ; in Pontus immaculate ; in Italy love of the gods ; in Samos sacred ; at the Hellespont mystic ; at Myndus divine ; in Bithynia Helen ; in Tenedos name of the sun ; in Caria Hecate ; in the Troad and at Dindyma . . . , Palentra (?), unapproachable, Isis ; at Berytus Maia ; at Sidon Astarte ; at Ptolemaï's understanding ; at Susa in the district by the Red Sea Sarkounis ; thou who also interpretest first of all in the fifteen commandments, ruler of the world ; guardian and guide, lady of the mouths of seas and rivers ; skilled in writing and calculation, understanding ; who also bringest back the Nile over every country ; the beautiful animal of all the gods ; the glad face in Lethe ; the leader of the muses ; the many-eyed ; the comely goddess in Olympus ; ornament of the female sex and affectionate ; providing sweetness in assemblies ; the lock of hair (?) in festivals ; the prosperity of observers of lucky days ; Harpocratis of the gods ; all-ruling in the processions of the gods, enmity-hating ; true jewel of the wind and diadem of life ; by whose command images and animals of all the gods, having . . . of thy name, are worshipped ; O lady Isis, greatest of the gods, first of names, Io Sothis ; thou rulest over the mid-air and the immeasurable ; thou devisest the weaving of . . . ; it is also thy will that women in health come to anchor with men ; all the elders at E . . . ctus sacrifice ; all the maidens who . . . at Heracleopolis turn (?) to thee and dedicated the country to thee ; thou art seen by those who invoke thee faithfully ; from whom . . . in virtue of the 365 combined days ; gentle and placable is the favour of thy two ordinances ; thou bringest the sun from rising unto setting, and all the gods are glad ; at the risings of the stars the people of the country worship thee unceasingly and the other sacred animals in the sanctuary of Osiris, they become joyful when they name thee ; the . . . spirits become thy subjects ; . . . (174-89) and thou bringest decay on what thou wilt and to the destroyed bringest increase, and thou purifiest all things ; every day thou didst appoint for joy ; thou . . . having discovered all the . . . of wine providedst it first in the festivals of the gods . . . ; thou becamest the discoverer of all things wet and dry and cold (and hot) of which all things are composed ; thou broughtest back alone thy brother, piloting him safely and burying him fittingly ; . . . (193-6) leader of diadems ; lady of increase and decay and of . . . (202-17) thou didst establish shrines of Isis in all cities for all time ; and didst deliver to all men observances and a perfect year ; and to all men . . . in every place ; thou didst show . . . in order that all men might know that thou . . . ; thou didst establish thy son Horus Apollo everywhere the youthful lord of the whole world and . . . for all time ; thou didst make the power of women equal to that of men ; and in the sanctuary thou didst . . . nations . . . (222-31) thou, lady of the land, bringest the flood of rivers . . . , and in Egypt the Nile, in Tripolis the Eleutherus, in India the Ganges ; owing to whom the whole and the . . . exists through all rain, every spring, all dew and snow, and all . . . and land and sea ; thou art also the mistress of all things for ever ; . . . (235-52) thou madest the . . . of the Dioscuri ; . . . thou hast dominion over winds and thunders and lightnings and snows ; thou, the lady of war and rule, easily destroyest tyrants by trusty counsels ; thou madest great Osiris immortal, and deliveredst to every country . . . religious observances ; likewise thou madest immortal Horus who showed himself a benefactor . . . and good ; thou art the lady of light and flames ; thou . . . a sanctuary at Memphis ; Horus having judged before-

hand that thou hadst appointed him successor (of his father) . . . enthroning him, . . . (265-70) thou didst establish him lord of the throne and oracular king over his father's house for all time; in thy honour out of three temples that at Busiris called . . .'

1-3. The 'House of Hephaestus' in l. 2, which was clearly in the neighbourhood of the southern apex of the Delta (cf. ll. 7 sqq.), no doubt refers to the Hephaesteum at Memphis (Strabo, p. 807), being apparently used as a name of the city, like the Egyptian *Hat-ka-ptah*, 'the temple of the divine personality of Ptah' (Wiedemann, *Herodots zweites Buch*, p. 47). The worship of Isis at Memphis is again mentioned in l. 249, where she is said to have a special *ἄδυτον* there; cf. Hdt. ii. 176. According to Diod. i. 22 and Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* ii. 1 her tomb was at Memphis, according to Lucian, *Adv. ind.* 14, her hair, and she appears on the coins of the city and nome. That the author of 1380 was himself a priest of Isis at Memphis is not unlikely; cf. p. 195.]*χμεῦνω* in l. 3 is an Egyptian appellation like e. g. *Ταχνηψω* in l. 75 (? *Ταχμεῦνω*), and one or two other titles are lost in the lacuna. Since the list of towns proceeds in a northerly direction,]*πόλει* in l. 1 would be expected to be not far south of Memphis, and 'Αφροδίτης] *πόλει*, the capital of the Aphroditopolite nome (*Atfih*) is more likely than *Νεῖλου*] *πόλει*, which is placed by Ptolemy in the Heracleopolite nome a little north of the capital, or 'Ηρακλέους] *πόλει* (*Ehmasia*). Another 'Αφροδίτης *πόλις* (l. 7, note) is distinguished by the mention of its nome. If, however, as is possible (cf. ll. 18, 70, 73, 87, 96, 116, notes), the geographical order is not being strictly adhered to in ll. 1-2, a town in the Heliopolite nome, which adjoined the Memphite on the north-east, might be meant. Heliopolis itself occurs in l. 38, and Heroöpolis (*Tell el Maskhūta*; Naville, *Pithom*, p. 6) is too far away to be suitable, but the 'Αφροδίτης *πόλις* which is coupled with Heliopolis in P. Tebt. 313. 2, if it was in the Heliopolite nome and different from the town of that name in the Prosopite nome (l. 7), may be referred to, or, possibly, Letopolis, if that town does not occur in l. 6, where it is expected. 'Ονε- in l. 1 is probably the beginning of another Egyptian title like]*χμεῦνω*, &c., the first syllable perhaps representing *un* as in 'Ονωφρις = *Un-nefer*, 'good being'. A proper name 'Ονής with gen. 'Ονέους occurs e. g. in P. Par. 5. xl. 4-5. With 'Ονείου *πόλις* (*Tell el Yahudīa*) or 'Ων, the Egyptian name of Heliopolis, there is not likely to be any connexion.

4.]*όφει*: the doubtful *ο* might be *σ*, but not *μ*, so that *Μέ]μφει* is inadmissible, even apart from the probability that the 'House of Hephaestus' means the town as well as the temple; cf. the preceding note.]*οφίς* was presumably in the Memphite or Letopolite nome. The Coptic town Shetnoufi (*Shatanáf*), about ten miles north of Letopolis, seems to be different.

4-5. Βούβασ[*τιν*: in Hdt. ii. 156 Βούβαστις is equated to 'Αρτεμις and made the daughter of Isis. The identification of Isis with the cat-headed goddess Bubastis occurs also in P. Brit. Mus. 121. 496, and cf. l. 37, note. Βούβασ[*τίτου* is unlikely owing to the absence of the article (cf. ll. 8 and 21, though later, in ll. 40 and 71, the article is omitted with nomes), and because Bubastis comes in l. 37. κ]αλουμένην is not used elsewhere after titles in 1380.

6. [έν *Αητ*]οῦς [π]ό[λε]ι [τῆ] *μεγάλη*: the name is uncertain and [έν . .]*μησ*[.]. [. .] [τῆ] *μ*. can be read, but a mention of Letopolis (*Ausim*) is expected between the Memphite and Prosopite nomes, and in this neighbourhood no other town likely to have been called 'the great' is known, though that title is not elsewhere applied to Letopolis.

μίαν: cf. the common phrase *εἰς Ζεὺς Σάραπις*, e. g. 1382. 20; Isis is called 'the only one' in her Egyptian titles (Budge, *op. cit.* 277). Μ(α)*ίαν*, however, is possible; cf. e. g. l. 103 and *Μεαν* in l. 116.

7-8. Aphroditopolis in the Prosopite nome is known from Strabo, p. 802 *συνάπτει δὲ . . . καὶ ἔτι ὁ Προσωπίτης νόμος, ἐν ᾧ 'Αφροδίτης πόλις*, and Pliny, *N. H.* v. 10 *Busiris, Cynopolis, Aphrodites, Saïs*. The identification with Niciu, which according to Ptolemy was the

capital of the Prosopite nome, was rejected by Wiedemann (*op. cit.* p. 195), rightly, as l. 12 shows. There is more to be said in favour of identifying it with the Ἀτάρβηχης of Hdt. ii. 41, which was in the Προσωπίτις νήσος and had a temple of Aphrodite, but that view is also rejected by Wiedemann. Ἀτάρβηχης occurs elsewhere only in Steph. Byz., who omits this Ἀφροδίτης πόλις. The Prosopite nome apparently included a triangular island between the main Canopic (western) branch and the Φερμουθιακὸς ποταμὸς, which issued at the Sebennyte mouth, the northern limit of the nome being perhaps the ancient canal called *Bahr el Farā'ūniā* ('Pharaonic river') which runs from east to west through *Menūf*; cf. Butler, *Arab conquest of Egypt*, p. 161. But it also extended to the west bank, since Θερενοῦθις (*Terrána*) was included in it; cf. B. G. U. 453. 2. There are ruins of a large town at *Zawyet Razin* on the Rosetta branch south-east of *Menūf*, which might belong to Ἀφροδίτης πόλις. Mrs. Butcher (*Story of the Church in Egypt*) would identify them with Niciu (cf. l. 12), but Butler (*l. c.*) follows Quatremère in placing that town, of which the Coptic name was *Pshati*, at *Shabshūr*, where the canal joins the Rosetta branch, about six miles south of *Ibshādi*, which is identified with Niciu in a Graeco-Coptic-Arabic list of equivalents (Amélineau, *Géogr.* p. 283). Petrie (*Naukratis*, i, p. 93) puts Niciu at *El Daharīā*, twelve or thirteen miles from Naukratis. The title 'mistress of the fleet' given to Isis at Ἀφροδίτης πόλις shows that it had a harbour of some importance. The form *στολαρχίς* seems to be new.

9. Ἀφροδίτην: i. e. in Egypt usually Hathor, with whom Isis was often identified (cf. Drexler, *op. cit.* 494-9), Horus being identified with Eros.

10. [ἐ]πὶ τοῦ Δέλτα: the writer tends to use ἐπὶ in place of ἐν when he is speaking of a town named after some natural object, e. g. in ll. 44 τοῦ Ἄπεως, 45 Δευκῆς Ἀκτῆς, 60 Σχεδίας, 61 τοῦ Ἡρακλίου, 74 τοῦ Κασίου, 75 τοῦ Ἐκρήγματος, 91 τῆς Πέτρας, but he is not consistent; cf. ll. 43 ἐν Καταβαθμῶ, 54 ἐν τῷ Ἰσιδίῳ. With districts he uses ἐν, e. g. in ll. 29 ἐν τῷ Σαίτη and 71 [ἐν] Μετληίτη and frequently in ll. 76 sqq. Probably therefore τὸ Δέλτα is a town rather than a district and identical with the κόμη rather than the χωρίον at the junction of the Canopic and Sebennytic branches described by Strabo, p. 788. τὸ Δέλτα in P. Rev. Laws xxxi. 6 is a district, but whether it corresponded to Strabo's χωρίον or was further north, as suggested by Hogarth (*Journ. of Hell. Stud.* xxiv. 2^a), or meant the Heliopolite nome, is not clear. On the whole it is probable that in xxxi. 6 Μενε]λαῖδι καὶ Δέλτα together form the Νιτριώτης of lxi. 20; cf. l. 21, note. Ptolemy's μέγα Δέλτα, μικρὸν Δ., and τρίτον Δ. are all east of the Prosopite nome. The stop after *χαριτοδότειραν* is not quite certain, as it might be a continuation of the cross-bar of the ν; but though l. 11 presents difficulties it does not seem possible to combine the first part of it into one long adjective.

11-12. For ἠπίαν cf. l. 155. -ῆ μίαν (cf. l. 6) might be read, but the letter preceding η is more like ι than τ. No place Καλάμισις is known from Greek writers, but both it and Καρή[ν]η apparently belong to the ἄλλαι πόλεις συχναί in the Prosopitis referred to by Hdt. ii. 41, and *Colomos*, which Geogr. Raven. 24 mentions next to *Nicum* (i. e. Νικίου: cf. l. 12) is perhaps identical with Καλάμισις, to which *Kaliūb*, near the Barrage, bears some resemblance. Καμμίσι could be read, but the division Κάμμι Ση. . αν, treating the last word as an Egyptian title like Ταχνηψιν, is unlikely owing to the correction of the ι of -μι from ει, for though irregular in his use of ι and ει in datives and frequently altering ει to ι, the scribe does not elsewhere alter a correct ει. Καρήνη is only known as a town in Mysia. With φιλ[ό]στοργον cf. l. 131 and the Ios Inscr. 24-5 ἐγὼ ὑπὸ τέκνων γονεῖς φιλοστοργεῖσθαι ἐνομοθέτησα.

12. τῆ Νεικίου: cf. ll. 7-8, note.

13. Either [.]θ ἄγίαν δότειραν or [.]θ[ά]να(το)ν δότ., or ἄθανα(σία)ν δοτ. (as one or two words) can be read. The incorrect form ἄθασιανδότειραν would be similar to ἀνδρασώτειραν in l. 55 and would refer to the immortality conferred upon Osiris and Horus by Isis through her discovery of τὸ τῆς ἀθανασίας φάρμακον (Diod. i. 25; cf. ll. 242-3, 246-7); but δότειραν occurs by itself in ll. 13 and 68 and is probably a separate word here. There are some traces of ink

above the second *av*, but they seem to be accidental. *θανάτοις δότεира* occurs in Hesiod, *Op.* 354. [*Α*]θαναν for *Ἀθήνην*, which occurs e. g. in l. 30, is unlikely.

τῶ *Ἰεράσῳ*: this town, situated probably north of Niciu and not far from Momemphis (l. 14), is unknown. *Ἰέρασα* at Cyrene is mentioned by Steph. Byz. and *Ἰέρασος ποταμός* in Dacia by Ptolemy.

14.]*αθροῖχιν*: perhaps *Ἀθροῖχιν*, for there is a blank space before *α*: but the surface of the papyrus is damaged, and e. g. *Τ]αθροῖχιν* (cf. *Ταχνηψιν* l. 75) is possible.

Μωμέμ[φι]: cf. Hdt. ii. 163 and Strabo, p. 803, who in describing the voyage from Schedia (cf. l. 60) to Memphis along the Canopic branch mentions the following places on his right, i. e. on the west bank, (1) *Χαβρίου κόμη*, i. e. probably the *Χαιρέου* of Byzantine geographers, (2) *Ἐρμού πόλις* (*Damanhūr*, cf. l. 18), (3) *Γυναικῶν πόλις καὶ Γυναικοπολίτης νομός* (cf. l. 21), (4) *ἐφεξῆς δὲ Μωμέμφις καὶ Μωμεμφίτης νομός· μεταξύ δὲ διώρυγες πλείους εἰς τὴν Μαρεώτιν*, (5) *ὑπὲρ δὲ Μωμέμφεως δύο νιτρίαι . . . καὶ νομὸς Νιτριώτης*, (6) *πόλις Μενέλαος* (cf. ll. 21 and 70, notes). Champollion's identification of Momemphis with *Menúf* is accepted by Wiedemann (*op. cit.* 572) and Daressy (*Rev. arch.* 3^{me} sér. xxv. 208), but not by Amélineau (*Géogr.* 250-1). This view would bring it within the Prosopite nome (cf. ll. 7-8, note). Strabo's statement that there was a Momemphite nome is at variance with the evidence of P. Rev. Laws and the coins of the nomes, and probably the *Μωμεμφίτης* was really a toparchy. From its position in 1380 Momemphis would be expected to be somewhat north-west of Niciu, and the name *Menúf* suggests *Μενοῦφίς* (l. 71, note) rather than Momemphis, though the identification of *Μενοῦφίς* with that *Menúf* also presents difficulties.

15. *ἄνασ]σαν*: Aphrodite was the chief deity of Momemphis according to Strabo, *l. c.*; but though]*ην* can be read, there is not room for *Ἀφροδίτ]ην*. For Isis as queen cf. p. 192 and l. 82, note.

Ψωχήμι: this place is no doubt identical with Steph. Byz. *Ψώχεμμς πολίχινιον Αἰγύπτου. Ἄρτεμιδώρος ἐν ὀγδόῳ γεωγραφουμένων· καὶ Περικερμς ἐκ δεξιῶν μερῶν καὶ Θαλαβαύδη καὶ Ψώχ.* Probably it and the two places mentioned in ll. 16-17 were in the Gynaecopolite or Nitriote nome. The towns of the Saïte nome apparently come in ll. 30-2, except Naucratis (l. 19, note). For [ὄ]ρμίσ[τριαν], which seems to be new, cf. l. 74 *ἐν Πηλουσίῳ ὄρμ.* Psochemis apparently had a harbour of some importance, and may have been situated at the separation of the two branches leading to the Canopic and Bolbitic (Rosetta) mouths, i. e. at or near *Kafr el Zayát*.

16. *Μύλωνι*: this town is known only from Steph. Byz. *Μύλων πόλις Αἰγύπτου. Ἐκαταῖος.*

17. *Κε . . κυλήμι*: this town, which is likely to have been near Hermopolis Parva (l. 18?) or Naucratis (l. 19), is unknown; cf. l. 15, note.

18. [*Ερ]μο[ῦ π]όλις*: the restoration is very uncertain, for Hermopolis *ἡ μικρά* (*Damanhūr*) would be expected to be mentioned as such in order to distinguish it from Herm. *ἡ μεγάλη* in the Heptanomia, Herm. *τοῦ Μενδησίου* (l. 52), and Herm. near Buto (l. 35?). Moreover Hermopolis Parva was north of Naucratis (l. 19) and probably of Nithine (l. 21, note), being in the *Ἀλεξανδρέων χώρα* according to Ptolemy, though this is not a very serious objection, for it was on the west bank of the Canopic branch (l. 14, note) and only twenty-four Roman miles from Nithine, and a change of direction from north-south to east-west in any case takes place before l. 27. But there would be room for another letter in the lacuna after *μο* (or *με*), and perhaps an unknown town [. .]*με[. . π]όλις* was mentioned here, which, if it was south of Naucratis (l. 19) like Niciu (l. 12) and Momemphis (l. 14), would not disturb the geographical order. Hermopolis Parva, however, if not mentioned here, was omitted altogether, unless it came in l. 26.

19. *Ναυκράτει*: *Neḳrâsh*, discovered by Petrie on the west side of the main branch, as correctly stated by Ptolemy but not by Strabo. In P. Rev. Laws lx. 18 it is coupled with

the Saïte nome, as in Ptolemy, but it issued coins distinct from those of the Saïte nome, the bulk of which was certainly on the east of the Canopic branch; cf. ll. 30-2 and l. 18, note.

ἀπάτειραν: the reading is practically certain, for though the vestiges of the first letter are very slight the second can only be π or η. The form is new. *ἀπάτωρ* occurs as an epithet of e. g. Hephaestus, but the point of its application to Isis is not clear. Elsewhere she is said to be the daughter of Cronos (i. e. Keb) and Rhea (Nut); cf. Plut. *De Is. et Os.* 12, Diod. i. 13, and the Ios Inscr. 11-12, while other legends made her the daughter of Hermes (Plut. *l. c.*) or of Zeus (i. e. Ammon) and Hera (Diod. *l. c.*). In 1380 Isis is often identified with Hera and Maia, the mother of Hermes.

εὐφρο[σύν]ην: cf. p. 193 and 'lady of joy and gladness' in her Egyptian titles (Budge *op. cit.* p. 277).

21. Ν[ι]θίνη τοῦ Γυναικο[πο]λείτου is no doubt *Nithine* of the Itin. Anton. between *Hermopolis* (cf. l. 18, note) and *Andro*, stated to be twenty-four and twelve miles respectively distant from them in the itinerary from Pelusium to Alexandria, while a few lines later in the itinerary from Alexandria to Memphis *Hermopolis* is stated to be twenty-one miles from *Andro*, so that there would seem to be an error in the figures. *Andro*, i. e. Ἄνδρων πόλις, is generally considered to be identical with *Γυναίκων πόλις* and appears to have been at *Kharbatá* near *Negíla* where the desert bends away to the west and canals lead to Lake Mareotis (cf. Strabo, p. 803 quoted in l. 14, note, and Amélineau, *Géogr.* 221). *Kum el Hisn* and *Kum Afrin*, mounds south of Naucratis, may be identical with two of the places mentioned in ll. 15-17 and 21-3. 1380 agrees with the earlier authorities Strabo, Pliny (*N. H.* v. 9. 9), and the coins (on which Isis or Hathor is represented) in mentioning the Gynaecopolite nome and ignoring the Andropolite, which is not mentioned before Ptolemy and P. Flor. 278 (third century), but is commonly found in later writers on Egypt except Steph. Byz. Neither name occurs in P. Rev. Laws lx-lxxii, and that]πολιτη in xxxi. 4 is Γυναικο]πολίτη is very doubtful. Ἡλιο]πολίτη suits the size of the lacuna better, and would have the advantage of reducing the differences in the two lists of nomes to the correspondence between Μενε]λαΐδι καὶ Δέλτα in xxxi. 5-6 and Νιτριώτη in lxi. 20; cf. ll. 10 and 70, notes. *Pithin*, which is found in Geogr. Raven. 12 among unknown places in the north-west Delta, is probably identical with *Nithine*, and Π[ι]θίνη could be read here, in which case the Itin. Anton., not the Geogr. Raven., would be corrupt. *Pathanon* was the Coptic name of the modern *Batanán*, between *Tanta* and *Menáf*, but this is too far south for *Νιθίνη*, which suggests a connexion with the goddess Neith and may well be the correct form. The mention of the nome implies that there was another *Nithine* in Egypt; cf. ll. 7-8, 40, 52, and 54, notes.

22. Πεφρή[μι]: this is very likely identical with the Πάπρημις of Hdt. ii. 63 and iii. 12, which Wiedemann (*op. cit.* p. 264) places in the eastern rather than the western Delta, being the site of a battle between Inaros and the Persians. The position, however, assigned to the Papremite nome in the list Βουσιρίτης, Σαΐτης, Χεμμίτης, Παπρ., νήσος ἢ Προσωπίτις καλεομένη, Ναθῶ (Hdt. ii. 165) indicates that it lay near the middle of the Delta, but rather toward the west, i. e. between *Tanta* and Lake *Borollos*, and such a situation for Papremis would harmonize with the position occupied by Pephremis between the Gynaecopolite nome (l. 21) and Buto (l. 27).

23. Ἐστία like Isis, was considered to be the daughter of Cronos and Rhea (Diod. i. 13). In late times she was identified with Demeter and Persephone, but not apparently elsewhere with Isis.

24. [κυ]ρείαν πάσης χώρας: cf. ll. 125-6, note, and the Ios Inscr. 3-4 ἐγὼ εἶμι ἢ τ[ύραν]ος πάσης χώρας. The deleted *Χνου* seems to be the beginning of an unknown town named after the god *Χνουβις* (Chnum). *Χνουβις* in the Thebaid is placed by Ptolemy opposite *Latopolis* (*Esna*).

25. Εσ[. . . : no suitable name for this town, which is likely to have been near Buto (l. 27), is known. *Eschetia* occurs in a Coptic list of bishoprics next to Naucratis, but this may refer to Σχεδία: cf. Amélineau, *Geogr.* p. 172. The doubtful σ might be ο or ω, but not λ or ρ, so that Ἐλ[ευσῖνι and Ἐρ[μοῦ πόλει (cf. l. 18, note) are excluded.

26. For Ἡραν cf. e. g. l. 32, and for δία[ν ll. 86 and 111. The α of Ἡραν has apparently been prolonged above the ν, perhaps by an afterthought. On the identification of Isis with Juno cf. Diod. i. 25 and Drexler, *op. cit.* 513-15. With what Egyptian goddess Hera was generally identified is not clear. A cataract inscription (C. I. G. 4893) identifies her with Satis. ἀμία]ν|τον ἐν (ε above the line) Δι.[is a less satisfactory reading, and ε]ν | Μένδ(ητ)ι α[is inadmissible, but ἐν Θμο]ύ[ει, which in Roman times superseded Mendes, may have followed δία[ν.

27. The supposed β of Βουτῶ is very doubtful, but that town is expected about this point. Its site has not yet been located with certainty, but Hogarth (*op. cit.* p. 4) accepts Petrie's proposal (*Naucratis*, i, p. 91) to identify it with *Tell Fera'in*. The name seems to have survived in the village of *Ebtu*. Hermopolis, which according to Strabo, p. 802, was near Buto, apparently comes later; cf. l. 35, note. According to Hdt. ii. 156 Leto, i. e. Uat, a winged-serpent goddess, protectress of Lower Egypt (Wiedemann, *op. cit.* p. 263), was the chief deity worshipped there, but Δη[τῶ does not suit the vestiges of the second letter, which seems to be round, and for λο[γιστικὴν cf. l. 124. Δητῶ, however, may have followed; cf. l. 79.

28. Θώνι: the reading is fairly certain. Strabo (p. 800) places it on the strip of coast between Pharos and the Canopic mouth τὸ δὲ παλαιὸν καὶ Θώνιν τινα πόλιν ἐνταῦθά φασι, ἐπώνυμον τοῦ βασιλέως τοῦ δεξαμένου Μενελαόν τε καὶ Ἑλένην ξενία: cf. Steph. Byz. κείται δὲ κατὰ τὸ στόμα τὸ Κανωβικόν, and Hdt. ii. 113. Parthey (*Erdkunde d. alten Aegypt.*) puts it east of the Canopic mouth on the site of *Tinna*.

ἀγάπ[ην: cf. l. 109 ἀγάπην θεῶν, which can be restored here, but ἀγάπην may be a title by itself like φιλίαν in l. 94.

28-9. If χρόνω is right, the preceding ω might be ἄνω: cf. τὸ ἄνω in ll. 38 and 42. The words seem to belong to a title, not a place-name; but the ν is very doubtful, and possibly ἐν]ωχρο] . . φ καὶ Ἄγω[should be read. For the coupling of two names cf. l. 101.

30. τῶ Σαῖτη: for a nome instead of a town cf. l. 71 ἐν] Μετηλίτη, and for a district apart from individual towns in it, ll. 86-8. For ν[ικη]τ[ριαν cf. l. 48 and Drexler, *op. cit.* 521. The chief deity at Saïs was Neith-Athena (Hdt. ii. 59), so that this identification of Isis with Athena was very natural; cf. Plut. *De Is. et Os.* 9 τὸ δ' ἐν Σαί τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἦν καὶ Ἴσιον νομίζουσιν κτλ., and 60 τὴν μὲν γὰρ Ἴσιον τῶ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ὀνόματι καλοῦσι. For Isis as νύμφη cf. the evidence for her relation to nymphs discussed by Drexler, *op. cit.* 529-30, especially a Myconus inscr. Ἴσι]δι [κοι]ράνω καὶ θεαῖς Νύμφαις.

31. Νηβεο[suggests a possible connexion with the modern *Nebeira*, close to Naucratis, which was in the Saïte nome (l. 19, note), but ἐν τῇ Βεο[(or Βεμ[) can be read, though after l. 13 the article is rarely used with place-names. The title may be Ἴ[σ]ω; cf. e. g. l. 76.

Καυῆ: the only known Egyptian towns of this name are (1) *Kawî* (*Kena*) in the Thebaid, (2) *Cene* which the Itin. Anton. places between *Tacona* (in the κάτω τοπαρχία of the Oxyrhynchite nome; cf. 1285. 130) and *Isiu*, i. e. probably in the Heracleopolite nome, and (3) a village in the Arsinoite nome (e. g. P. Tebt. 345). *Chenopolis* occurs in Geogr. Raven. 111 in the list *Xoy* (Ξόις: cf. l. 42), *Tele*, *Chenop.*, *Με(μ)νονία*; and *Caenopolis* id. 125 in the list *Tinoy* (Antinoë?), *Caenop.*, *Selitra*, *Chara* (Χάραξ?; cf. l. 72, note), *Nichis* (Νικίου?), *Nastrim*, *Babilon*. The arrangement is not clear in either case, but *Chenopolis* seems to refer either to *Kawî* = *Kena* or to *Chenoboscium*, while *Caenopolis* might be our *Kawî*, which was probably in the Saïte nome.

32. Σάι: cf. l. 30, note.

33. Ἴσείφ: this is the natural point for mentioning Iseum (Steph. Byz., Geogr. Raven.; *Isidis oppidum*, Pliny), which had one of the most important temples of Isis in the Delta. The ruins of the town are at *Behbit el Hagar*, about eight miles north of Sebennytus (*Samanūd*; cf. the next entry), and it no doubt belonged to the Sebennyte nome. For Ἴσιν cf. e. g. l. 23; at the Ἰσίδιον τοῦ Σεθροῖτου (l. 54) she was called ἀνδρ(ο)σώτειρα.

34. For ἐπίνοιαν cf. l. 60, and for δυνάστιν e. g. l. 41.

35. εἰν] Ἐρ]μοῦ πόλει: there is some doubt about this name, which may be read εἰν.]εμου πόλει. If Ἐρ]μοῦ is right, this town seems to be the Hermopolis περὶ τὴν Βουτόν on an island (Strabo, p. 802), since Herm. in the Mendesian nome comes in l. 52 and for Herm. Parva l. 18 is a much more suitable place than l. 35. The site of this Herm. is unknown; from its position here between Sebennytus (*Samanūd*) and Diospolis, which seems to have been in the lower Sebennyte nome (l. 36, note), it would be expected also to lie in one of the two divisions of that nome, and such a situation is not inconsistent with Strabo's statement that Herm. was near Buto, which was mentioned in l. 27. The latter town was the capital of the Φθενέτης νομός according to Ptolemy, and if rightly placed at *Tell Fera'in* (cf. l. 27, note), it was close to the *Bahr Nashart*, which Hogarth (*l.c.*) identifies with the Θερμουθιακὸς ποταμὸς of Ptolemy and makes the boundary between the Φθενέτης νομός and its eastern neighbour, the Σεβεννύτης κάτω. On the east side of this canal, in the district between *Tell Fera'in* and *Kām Khanziri*, which Hogarth has identified on good evidence with *Paχνεμοῦνις*, the capital of the Σεβεννύτης κάτω according to Ptolemy, are the ruins of a large town at *Hawalid*, which Hogarth regards as the site of Phragonis (not mentioned in 1380), and mounds of several smaller towns, e. g. *Haddadi* (cf. Hogarth's map), one of which may well have been Hermopolis.

36. βασ[ί]λεισ[σαν, ἀγε]ίαν: for Isis as queen, her true name according to Apul. *Metam.* xi. 5 (cf. l. 82, note), cf. Drexler, *op. cit.* 512-13. The εἰ of ἀγε]ίαν may have been corrected, as in the previous line, where εἰ is not certainly deleted; cf. l. 250, critical note.

Δειὸς π[ό]λει τῆ μεικ[ρᾶ]: Diospolis Parva elsewhere refers to *Hā* in Upper Egypt, but this Diospolis is clearly that mentioned by Strabo, p. 802 πλησίον δὲ Μένδητος καὶ Διόσπολις καὶ αἱ περὶ αὐτὴν λίμναι καὶ Λεοντόπολις· εἰτ' ἀπώτερω ἢ Βούσιρις ἐν τῷ Βουσιρίτῃ νομῷ καὶ Κυρόσπολις, Hermippus Fr. 50 θάπτεται (sc. Demetrius Phalereus) ἐν τῷ Βουσιρίτῃ πλησίον Διοσπόλεως, Hierocles, *Synec.* Νικίου, Ξόις, Φραυνης (i. e. Φραγῶνις), Παχνεμο(ῦ)νις, Διόσπολις, Σεβέν(ν)υτος, and the coins inscribed Διοσπ(όλεως), or Διοσπ(ολίτου), κ(άτω). Its site is uncertain. Hogarth (*op. cit.* p. 12) places it at *Tell el Balamūn*, a little north-east of *Sherbīn* on the west bank of the Damietta branch, about half-way between Sebennytus and the mouth, and Daressy (*Rev. arch.* 3^{me} sér., p. 208) at *Belkās* about seven miles west of *Sherbīn*, but such a position creates a considerable difficulty with regard to the statement of Hermippus that Diospolis was in the Busirite nome, since that nome was south of the Sebennyte and cannot have extended in the direction of Damietta; cf. ll. 49-50, note. Against Hermippus, however, is to be set the fact that in 1380 the Busirite nome comes later, and the position of Diospolis in l. 36 rather suggests that it lay somewhere between Sebennytus and Bubastis. *Tell Mokdam* near *Mit Ghamr* would be suitable, but that site has been sometimes considered to be Leontopolis (l. 58), and the mention of the lakes near Diospolis suggests that it lay not far from the coast. The issue of separate coinage indicates that it was in Hadrian's time the capital of a nome called Διοσπολίτης κάτω, but this is ignored by P. Rev. Laws, Strabo, and Ptolemy, and probably Diospolis belonged earlier to the Sebennyte nome. The Mendes papyri of the second century do not mention it, but it occurs with other nomes in a third-century ostrakon (Milne, *Theban Ostraca*, p. 151).

37-8. ἐν Βουβάστῳ τὸ ἄνω: Bubastus (the form -τις is not applied to the town in papyri) is *Tell Basta*, near *Zagazig*. τὸ ἄνω (cf. l. 42) is a curious expression, and it is not clear whether the reference is to space (cf. ll. 144-5) or time. If to the latter (cf. l. 82, note),

there may be a connexion with l. 28 ἄν]ω χρόνῳ. Bubastus was said to have been founded in honour of Isis; cf. Diod. i. 27 and the Inscr. of Ios 16.

38. Ἡλίου π[όλ]ει: about seven miles north-east of Cairo; cf. ll. 1-3, note.

39. Ἀ[θ]ρίβ[ι]: *Tell Atrīb*, near *Benha*.

Μαίαν: cf. p. 192. As the mother of Hermes, she was a natural deity to identify with Isis, whom some legends made the daughter of Hermes (cf. l. 19, note). Mr. Griffith well compares the Greek name of *Damanhūr*, Hermopolis Parva, where Hermes = Horus, probably a very old identification made before Egypt was familiar to the Greeks; cf. p. 224.

ὀρθωσίαν: cf. l. 98. This term is a common title of Artemis. The explanation of Schol. Pind. *Ol.* 3. 54 ὅτι ὀρθοῖ εἰς σωτηρίαν ἢ ὀρθοῖ τοὺς γεννωμένους is preferred by Höfer (*Roscher, Lex. d. griech. u. röm. Mythol.* iii. 1213). Applied to Zeus the term = *stator*.

40. Ἱερά Φθεμφ[θ]ού[τ]ου: Ἱερά occurs as a village-name in Egypt in the Arsinoite nome (P. Tebt. ii. p. 380), but this town was unknown. The Phthemphuthite nome, which is ignored by P. Rev. Laws and Strabo and of which the capital was Ταοῦα (Ptolemy) or ταναϊτῶν πόλις (P. Brit. Mus. 921. 6), adjoined the Athribite nome (l. 39) on the west, being north of the Prosopite nome (l. 8); cf. Itin. Anton. which places *Tava* twelve miles from *Andro* (l. 21, note) and thirty from *Cyno* (ll. 49-50, note). The spelling varies, Φθεμφ() and Φθεμφουε() being found on coins, Φθεμφουθί in the best MSS. of Ptolemy, Φθεμφουθ() in P. Brit. Mus. 921, Φθεμφούθ in P. Ryl. 78. 5, *Phthemphu* in Pliny, *N. H.* v. 49. It is not certain that a letter is lost after φ. For the omission of τοῦ cf. l. 71 and ll. 4-5, note.

λω[τ]οφόρον: the lotus-flower was a symbol of immortality in late times (Wiedemann, *op. cit.* p. 375) and the epithet is very appropriate here to Isis, who on the coins of the Phthemphuthite nome is represented with a lotus (Dattari, *Numi Augg. Alex.* 6350). The first ο of λω[τ]οφόρον is more like σ, but φωσφόρον cannot be read and θεσ[μ]οφόρον (cf. ll. 119-20) is also unsuitable.

41. Τεούχι: this is probably identical with Steph. Byz. Τεύαχισ· πόλις Αἰγύπτου. ἔστι καὶ λίμνη ὁμώνυμος, but is otherwise unknown. It may have been in the northern part of the Phthemphuthite nome (cf. l. 40) or in the Xoïte (cf. l. 42), or even further north (cf. the next note), if the Xoïte nome did not extend to the coast. The name suggests a possible derivation for Lake *Edkâ*, the Greek name of which is unknown: the village *Edkâ* is between *Abukîr* and *Rosetta*.

41-2. τοῖς Βουκόλεῦσι: the Βουκόλοι, as they are elsewhere called, were primitive inhabitants of the marshes along the north-west coast, and revolted in A. D. 172. How far east they extended is not clear. The Βουκολικὸν στόμα of Hdt. ii. 17 is supposed by Wiedemann (*op. cit.* p. 96) and others to be the Phatnitic mouth, which was between the Sebennytic and Mendesian, but Sethe (Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencycl.* s. v. Βουκόλοι), followed by Wilcken, *Chrest.* 21, introd., rejects this view, though Herodotus distinguishes the Bucolic from the Bolbitine and Canopic mouths, which were on the west. Strabo mentions the Βουκόλοι once (p. 792) in connexion with Alexandria, once (p. 802) in connexion with the district between the Sebennytic and Phatnitic mouths. τὰ Βουκόλια in B. G. U. 625 (cf. P. Hamburg 39) is regarded by Wilcken (*l. c.*) as a district, but may mean the town *Bucolia* in Geogr. Raven. 9, *Naucratis* being no. 6 and *Pithin* (cf. l. 21, note) no. 12.

42. Ξοί: the ξ is very doubtful and Ξοί possibly occurred in l. 32. If it did, ἐν Ξοίτ[η] ἄνω, 'the upper division of the Xoïte nome' might be read here; but for τ[δ] ἄνω cf. l. 38. Strabo describes its position (p. 802) ἐν δὲ τῇ μεσογείῳ τῇ ὑπὲρ τοῦ Σεβεννυτικοῦ καὶ Φατνιτικοῦ στόματος Ξοίς ἐστὶ καὶ νῆσος καὶ πόλις ἐν τῷ Σεβεννυτικῷ νομῷ. ἔστι δὲ καὶ Ἐρμούπολις (cf. l. 52, note) καὶ Λυκούπολις καὶ Μένδης. An ancient list of Greek, Coptic, and Arabic equivalents (Amélineau, *Géogr.* p. 410) identifies Xoïs with *Sakha*, about half-way between Hermopolis Parva and Thmuis. Pliny, *N. H.* v. 9. 9, the coins of the nomes, and Ptolemy show that there was a separate Xoïte nome in the first and second centuries, but Strabo's statement that

Xoïs was in the Sebennyte nome (cf. l. 33) earlier is confirmed by the absence of the Xoïte nome from the nome-lists in P. Rev. Laws.

43. Καταβαθμῶ: this can refer either to κ. μέγας (*Akaba el Kebîr*) on the boundary between Egypt and the Marmarica according to Strabo, p. 678, and in the παράλιος of the Libyan nome according to Ptol., or, more probably, to κ. μικρός (*Akaba el Soghîr*), placed by Ptol. some distance inland behind Λευκῆ Ἀκτὴ (l. 45) and nearer to Apis (l. 44) than is κ. μέγας.

πρ[ό]νοιαν: Isis appears as πρόνοια on Alexandrian coins (Poole, *Catal.* p. 176); cf. Plutarch, *De Is. et Os.* 3 ἔτι πολλοὶ μὲν Ἑρμοῦ, πολλοὶ δὲ Προμηθέως ἱστορήκασιν αὐτὴν θυγατέρα δὲ τὸν μὲν ἕτερον σοφίας καὶ προνοίας, Ἑρμῆν δὲ γραμματικῆς καὶ μουσικῆς εὐρετὴν νομίζοντες. διὸ καὶ τῶν ἐν Ἑρμοῦπόλει Μουσῶν τὴν προτέραν Ἴσιν ἅμα καὶ Δικαιοσύνην καλοῦσι, σαφῆν οὖσαν, ὥσπερ εἴρηται, καὶ δεικνύουσιν τὰ θεῖα τοῖς ἀληθῶς καὶ δικαίως ἱεραφόροις καὶ ἱεραστοῖσι προσαγορευομένοις. Cf. also Apul. *Metam.* xi. 18 *dea providens* and Drexler, *op. cit.* 540.

44. ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἄπεως φρόνησιν: for ἐπί cf. l. 10, note, and for Apis Hdt. ii. 18 οἱ . . . ἐκ Μαρῆς τε πόλιος καὶ Ἄπιος, Pliny, v. 39 *Apis* . . . *nobilis religione Aegypti locus*, Strabo, p. 779, and Ptol. iv. 5, who both place it a little west of Paraetionium, an important town in Roman times but ignored by 1380. Fourteau (*Bull. de l'Inst. égypt.* 5^{me} sér. viii. 99) suggests that it was near *Râs 'umm Rokhâm*. Apis was probably the ancient capital of the Libyan nome, corresponding to *Nu ent Hapi* 'the town of Apis' in Egyptian texts. For Isis as φρόνησις cf. l. 124 and Plut. *De Is. et Os.* 60.

45. Λευκῆς Ἀκτῆς: cf. Strabo, p. 799, Ptol. iv. 5. It was on the coast east of Paraetionium and north of Καταβαθμὸς μικρός (l. 43, note), and is generally identified with *Râs el Kanais*.

Μοῦχιω: the first three letters are very doubtful. Μοῦχίς is the name of villages in the Arsinoïte (P. Tebt. 609), Heracleopolite (P. Hib. 68), and Oxyrhynchite (1342) nomes. There is no likelihood of any connexion with Μωχιάς, the title of Isis at Acoris (C. I. G. 4703 c), which refers to the Μωχίτης τόπος of the Hermopolite nome (P. Reinach. 15. 12, &c.).

46. Ἑσερέμφ[ι]ν: cf. the Theadelphia inscr. published by Breccia in *Bull. de la Soc. archéol. d'Alex.* 1914, where a temple of Ἴσις Ἑσερέμφις is mentioned in l. 17. Spiegelberg (*l. c.*) translates the term 'making a good name'.

Φραγούρων πόλις: i. e. the Φαγγοριόπολις of Strabo, p. 805, which Steph. Byz. calls Φαγρόριον, the Geogr. Raven. *Phagorior*. Strabo mentions it as the capital of the Phagroriopollite nome (which is ignored by other authorities) along with Ἡρωώνπολις (*Tell el Maskhûta*) and Φάκουσα (*Fakûs* or, as Naville thinks, *Seft el Henna*), and it probably lay in the *Wadi Tumilât* or on the east bank of the Pelusiac branch in the Arabian nome. Bubastus, Pharbaethus, and Tanis, capitals of nomes on the west bank of that branch, occur at some little distance (ll. 37, 53, and 59).

47-8. Χοατίνη seems to have been in the south-east of the Delta, but whether the lacuna in l. 48 contained another place-name or a second title of Isis is uncertain. If ἐν is right Φακούσις or Ἡρώων πόλις may be supplied; cf. the preceding note. For γ[ρ]αμματε[ικ]ή[ν] cf. l. 123 and p. 193.

49-50. Κυνοῦς πόλις τοῦ Βου[σε]μ[ι]ρε[ί]τ[ο]ν: or, less probably, Λύκων πόλις τοῦ Β.; cf. Rosetta Inscr. 22. This Cynopolis is mentioned in conjunction with Busiris (cf. l. 51) by Strabo, p. 802, Pliny, *N. H.* v. 64, Hierocles, and Meletus, *Brev.* p. 188, while the Itin. Anton. places it thirty miles east of Taba (in the Phthemphuthite nome; cf. l. 40, note) and twenty-five west of Thmuis (*Tmei el Amdîd*) in about the centre of the Delta, which position accords very well with Herodotus' statement (ii. 59) that Busiris was ἐν μέσῳ τῷ Δέλτα. That town is identified in a list of Graeco-Coptic-Arabic equivalents with *Abusîr*, three miles south of *Samanûd* (Sebennytus; cf. l. 33), which is confirmed by the equation of Βούσιρις to *Abusîr* in the case of the Letopolite town (C. I. G. 4699. 12) and the Heracleopolite (B. G. U. 1061. 8, &c.), while Κουνῶ(ν) κάτω is identified with the Coptic *Panou* and Arabic *Beme*, a few

kilometres south of Abusîr. Ptolemy also places Busiris a little south of Sebennytus, but puts both towns much too far south, his whole arrangement of the eastern Delta being vitiated by the wrong position assigned to the *Τραιανὸς Ποταμὸς* (*Wadi Tumilât*). P. Rev. Laws in xxxi. 7 mentions the Busirite nome between the Sebennyte and Mendesian, and in lxiii. 6 between the Mendesian and Athribite.

50. Πραξι[ι]δ[ι]κ[η]ν: cf. Türk and Höfer in Roscher, *op. cit.* iii. 2912-30. Originally perhaps connected with the Lycian goddess Panyasis, Praxidice (or three Praxidicae) was a deity akin to the Erinyes and Persephone, who is called Πραξιδικη in *Orph. Hymn.* 29. 5. For the identification of Isis with Persephone cf. l. 72, note.

51. Βουσείρει: cf. ll. 49-50, note, 269-71, and Hdt. ii. 59-60.

τύχην, ἀγαθήν: for Isis as Fortune cf. Drexler, *op. cit.* 545-6, and for ἀγαθήν (which is probably separate from τύχην) cf. l. 95 and C. I. G. 5041.

52. Ἑρμοῦ π[ό]λε[ι] τοῦ Μενδησίου: cf. P. Tebt. 340. 5, which shows that it gave its name to a toparchy, P. Ryl. 217. 15-34, Strabo, p. 802, quoted in l. 42, note, and Steph. Byz., who states that it was κατὰ Θμοῦιν. Since the Mendesian nome extended to the coast on the north-east, being probably bounded on the west by the Damietta Nile, it probably did not extend far south of Mendes-Thmuis. *Baklîa*, which is generally identified with Hermopolis, is about three miles west of *Tmei el Amdid*. Φερνοῦφις (l. 57) was also in this nome. Thmuis, the capital at this period (cf. Ptolemy and P. Ryl.), does not occur in 1380 except possibly in l. 26.

53. Φαρβαίθω: *Horbêl*, the capital of a nome which lay between the Bubastite and Tanite.

54. τῷ Ἰσιδίῳ τοῦ Σεθροῖτου: this place, named after a temple of Isis, was previously unknown; cf. Ἰσειῶ in l. 33. The Sethroite nome was in the extreme north-east of the Delta; cf. l. 56, note.

55. ἀνδρασώτειραν seems to be an incorrectly formed compound (cf. l. 13, note) rather than two words, though for a confusion of sex cf. ll. 135-6, note.

56. Ἡρακλέ[ους] πόλει τοῦ Σεθροῖτου: the nome is added to distinguish it from Heracleopolis Magna in the Heptanomia. Ptolemy makes Ἡρακλέους μικρὰ πόλις (v. l. Σέθροῖς) the capital of the nome, and places it to the south-south-east of Pelusium; the Itin. Anton. places it twenty-two miles from Pelusium and the same distance from Tanis. It would be expected to be on the Pelusiatic arm, not far from Daphnae. C. Müller (Ptol. iv. 5. 24) identifies it with *Tell el Serig* (= *Tell Battîkh*).

57. Φερνοῦφι: this town was in the Mendesian nome, giving its name to a toparchy; cf. P. Ryl. 216. 274 and 217. 57, 59.

58. Λε[ο]ντοπόλει: this place, the capital of a nome, is sometimes identified with *Tell Mokdam* near *Mit Ghamr*, between Sebennytus (l. 33) and Athribis (l. 39); cf. Strabo, p. 802, quoted in l. 36, note. Jomard, however, placed it east of Thmuis near Lake *Menzala*. Ptolemy makes it south of Thmuis and west of Pharbaethus, but north of Sebennytus and Busiris, which is inconsistent with such a relation to Thmuis and Pharbaethus. P. Rev. Laws xxxi. 8 mentions the Leontopolite nome between the Mendesian and Sethroite nomes, which rather favours Jomard's view, but in lxvii. 8 between the Tanite and Pharbaethite nomes, which favours the identification with *Tell Mokdam*.

ἀσπίδα: Isis is often represented as a snake; cf. Drexler, *op. cit.* 533-9. In P. Amh. 128. 56 προφήτη(ς) Ἰσιδο(ς) Ὀφεω(ς) it is not clear whether Ὀφεω(ς) is a title of Isis or a proper name, as it is apparently in l. 116 of the same papyrus. ἐλπίδα is a less suitable reading than ἀσπίδα.

59. Τάνι: *San*, near Lake *Menzala*. χαριτόμορφος is a new compound.

60. Σχεδίας: cf. Strabo, p. 800 διέχει δὲ τετράσχιονον τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας ἢ Σχεδία, κατοικία πόλεως ἐν ἧ τὸ ναύσταθμον τῶν θαλαμηγῶν πλοίων κτλ.

61. τ[ο]ῦ Ἡρακλίου: cf. Strabo, p. 801 μετὰ δὲ τὸν Κανωβόν (cf. l. 62) ἔστι τὸ Ἡράκλειον τὸ Ἡρακλέους ἔχον ἱερόν, Steph. Byz., who calls it Ἡρακλεόπολις (cf. l. 56), and Geogr. Raven. 2 *Eraclia*, no. 1 being *Alexandria*. For Isis in her familiar capacity of goddess of the sea cf. p. 193 and Drexler, *op. cit.* 474-90.

62. Κανώβω: near *Abukír*, but its precise situation is not certain.

μουσαναγωγόν: apparently a new form; cf. l. 128. For Isis as leader of the Muses cf. Plut. *De Is. et Os.* 3 quoted in l. 43, note.

63. Με[ο]ύθι: cf. C. I. G. 4683 b. 1 Εἰσιδι Φαρία Εἴσω τὴν ἐν Μενούθι, Steph. Byz. *Μένουθις Αἰγυπτία κόμη πρὸς τῷ Κανωπῷ*, and Epiphanius, *Adv. Haeres.* iii, p. 1093, where a temple τῆς *Μενουθιτιδος* is mentioned.

ἀλήθειαν: cf. the Ios Inscr. 32 ἐγὼ τὸ ἀληθὲς καλὸν ἐνομοθέτησα νομί[ε]σθαι, and P. Brit. Mus. 46. 148 ἐγὼ (sc. Abrasax) εἶμι ἢ ἀλήθεια.

64. Με[υ]ούει: it is not certain that any letter is lost between *ν* and *ο*, and only a narrow one is admissible; *Μενούθι* (cf. l. 63) or *Μενού[θ]ει* cannot be read, although the following word might be *τοῦ*. *Σηκτιζ* . . . is, however, a very unlikely name, the only one at all resembling it being *Σενσκειτήν[η]* in C. I. G. 4839. 11 Ἰσιδι τῆ *Σενσ.*, referring to the modern *Sekket* in the Mons Berenicidis. The other places in ll. 60-76 are on or near the coast, so far as they can be identified, and ἢ κτίζεται is confirmed by l. 151 ἔκτισαν σοὶ τὴν χώραν (cf. also l. 280), while for Ἰοῦς cf. ll. 143-4 Ἰοῖ Σῶθι. *Io* was often identified with Isis in Alexandrian times; cf. Drexler, *op. cit.* 439-40. π[όλ(ε)ι]ς is possible in l. 64, but [ἡ]μερείας does not seem appropriate in l. 65, and for π[όλις E]ῦ[η]μερεῖ[α]ς there is not room, so that the construction of Ἰοῦς remains obscure.

65-6. τοῦ Μ[.]νεστίου: the first letter is nearly certain, but the rest are very doubtful, especially *ιο*, which might be read as *ε*. Μ[ε]νελαΐτου is inadmissible. *μεγίστου* is probably a mistake for *μεγίστην*: cf. l. 21. *γυπόμορφος* is a natural epithet of Isis, who is often represented with a vulture's wings; cf. l. 220 and Drexler, *op. cit.* 473-4.

67. Ταποσίρι: two towns of this name in the north-west of Egypt are known: (1) *Ταπ.* (ἢ *μεγάλη*) east of Lake Mareotis, mentioned by Strabo, p. 799, but by other writers called *Ταφόσιρις*, the modern *Abusír*, with a temple and a reputed tomb of Osiris, (2) *Ταπ.* ἢ *μικρά* between Alexandria and Canopus (Strabo, pp. 799-800). The towns mentioned in ll. 60-3 and the *Μετηλίτης* in l. 72 suggest the second, but *Πλωθίνη* in l. 73 is placed by Ptolemy close to the first, and the sites of other places found in ll. 60-73 being doubtful, it is not clear which of the two is meant. A dedication to Isis with other gods from *Tap. Parva* was published by Néroutsos, *Rev. arch.* 1887, p. 214, and *Domina Isis Taposiris* occurs in the dedication of a statue found at Faesulae (C. I. L. xi. 1544); a papyrus to be published in Part XII mentions *ἱερὰ (γῆ) Ἰσιδος Ταποσειριάδος* in the Oxyrhynchite nome.

68-9. τῆ *Νήσω*: this is more probably *Φάρος νήσος* off Alexandria (Ptol. iv. 5; cf. p. 195) than the desert island off the Canopic mouth (Scylax, *Peripl.* 84) or *Νῆσοι*, a place in the Mareotis (Anon. *Stat. mar. magn.* 22-3). *Nesi*, which the Geogr. Raven. mentions next after *Απυρίον* (Ἄγκυρῶν πόλις in the Heracleopolite nome?) and *Κυνοπόλις* (apparently in the Heptanomia), is probably different, as is *Σιδωνία νήσος* (Strabo, p. 799), between *Λευκὴ Ἀκτὴ* (l. 45) and *Ταποσιρις Magna* (l. 67, note). For *ταχυν[ί]κην* cf. l. 84, note.

69. Πευκεστίδι: this was only known from Geogr. Raven. 73 *Peucestis* among several unrecognizable towns, *Naucratis* being no. 61 and *Buto* no. 78. The title *κυβερνήτης* suggests that it was on the coast (cf. l. 74 ἐν *Πηλουσίῳ ὀρμίστριαν*), probably not far from Alexandria.

70. Μελαΐδι: this town or district is unknown, and perhaps *Με(νε)λαΐδι* should be read; cf. P. Rev. Laws xxxi. 6. *Μενε]λαΐδι* there, however, if correct, seems to mean the district round the πόλις *Μενέλαος* mentioned by Strabo, p. 803 (cf. l. 14, note), as being in the south-west of the Delta (*Μενε]λαΐδι* corresponds, partly at any rate, to the Nitriote nome; cf. l. 21,

note), whereas in the light of the preceding entries Με(νε)λαῖδι here would more appropriately refer to the *Μενελαίτης νομός*, of which Canopus (l. 62) was the capital according to Ptolemy, but which is ignored by P. Revenue Laws. The term *Μενελαῖς*, however, does not occur elsewhere, and with Με(νε)λαῖδι it would be best to suppose that the list has made a sudden divergence to the south of the Delta in spite of ll. 60-8 and 72-5, which are concerned with the north coast; cf. the next note and that on l. 18.

71. Μ[ε]νούφι: this place is unknown; and Μ[α]νούφι or Μ[ε]νούφι might be read. The name strongly suggests the Arabic *Menúf* (cf. l. 14, note), but of the two towns of that name one lies between *Tanta* and Cairo, i. e. too far south to be appropriate unless Με(νε)λαῖδι be read in l. 70, and the other (*Mehallet Menúf*), about five miles north of *Tanta*, is identified with Ὀνούφισ (the capital of a nome) in a Graeco-Coptic-Arabic list of equivalents; cf. Daressy, *Rev. arch.* 3^{me} sér. xxv, p. 208.

στρ[α]τίαν: cf. ll. 83 and 102. *στράτιος* is a well-known epithet of Zeus and Athena (cf. ll. 30 and 72).

71-2. [ἐν] Μετηλείτη: there is no room for τῶ in the lacuna. The writer becomes more sparing in the use of the article as he proceeds; cf. ll. 4-5, note. The Metelite nome is placed by Ptolemy between the Μέγας ποταμός (i. e. the main western branch) and the Τάλυ ποταμός, which issued at the Bolbitine (Rosetta) mouth, i. e. in the district now mainly occupied by Lake *Edkú* (cf. l. 41, note). It is ignored by P. Rev. Laws and Strabo, but found on the coins of the nomes (on which Isis or Hathor is represented), so that it seems to have been created or revived in the first century.

72. Κ[ό]ρη: cf. l. 105 and l. 50, note. She was worshipped at Oxyrhynchus, as is shown by a papyrus to be published in Part XII.

Χάρακος: cf. Strabo, p. 760, who after describing the Κάσιον ὄρος (cf. l. 75) proceeds εἶθ' ἢ ἐπὶ Πηλούσιον (cf. l. 74) ὁδός, ἐν ἧ τὰ Γέρρα καὶ ὁ τοῦ Χαβρίου λεγόμενος χίραξ καὶ τὰ πρὸς τῶ Πηλουσίῳ βάραθρα. *Chara* in Geogr. Raven. 127 (cf. l. 31, note) is perhaps identical.

73. Πλωθίνη: this town in the Μαρεώτης νομός on the coast west of Alexandria not far from Taposiris Magna gave its name to the Πλωθινίτης κόλπος: cf. Hdt. ii. 6, Strabo, p. 799, Scylax, *Peripl.* 105, Ptol. iv. 5. This entry is somewhat out of place; cf. ll. 67-72, notes.

74. Πηλουσίῳ: *Tell Farama*, about twenty-five miles south-east of Port Said. Ptolemy refers to it by itself apart from the Sethroite nome, of which Heracleopolis was the capital (cf. l. 56, note), and it issued separate coins, on which Isis occurs. Here it is also separated from the Sethroite nome, and is followed by the Κάσιον ὄρος (*Rás el Kurín*; cf. Hdt. ii. 6 and Wiedemann's note) and the Ἐκρηγμα (sc. Σιρβωνίδος λίμνης), which Ptolemy assigns together with Ῥινοκόλουρα (*El Arísh*) to a distinct region, the Κασιῶτις. Ῥινοκόλουρα, however, occurs in l. 93 along with towns in Palestine, and was clearly regarded by the author of 1380 as beyond the Egyptian frontier, as in Pliny, *N. H.* v. 68, and Strabo, who extends Φοινίκη up to Pelusium (p. 756).

75. For τοῦ Κασίου cf. the preceding note, and for Ταχνηψιν p. 192.

77. Ἀραβία probably means the Sinai peninsula or Arabia Felix rather than the νομός Ἀραβία. Petra, perhaps the capital of Arabia Felix, comes in l. 91. For θεόν cf. l. 107 and the Ios Inscr. 15-16 ἐγὼ εἶμι ἢ παρὰ γυναιξὶ θεὸς καλουμένη.

77-8. τῆ [Νή]σφ: cf. l. 68. At the end of the line τ is very doubtful, and perhaps ἐν Ση[.].σφ or Τη[.].σφ should be read; that any letters are lost is not certain. If τῆ [Νή]σφ is right, the reference may well be to an island on the west coast of Arabia called Ἴσιδος ἱερά (Agatharchides in *Geogr. Gr. min.* i. 180, Diod. iii. 44), thought to be the modern *Barahkán*; cf. Drexler, *op. cit.* p. 376.

78. The verb ἱερονοκοτελεῖν is apparently new. For Isis-worship in Lycia cf. l. 79 and Drexler, *Num. Zeitschr.* xxi. 184 sqq.

79. Δητώ: cf. l. 27, note. Myra = *Dembre*.

80-1. ἐλευθε[ρί]αν : ἐλευθέ[ρ]αν could be read, but Isis Eleutheria occurs on Alexandrian coins of Galba (Poole, *Coins of Alex.* p. 23).

ἄφρῳ εἰς ἐφ[ό]δων, εὐ[ρ]έτριαν : ἀφείσιος is an epithet of Zeus in Pausan. i. 44. 9. ἔφοδος in papyri usually means 'attack', and ἐφ[ό]δων seems to depend on ἄφρῳ rather than εὐρέτριαν, in connexion with which it would have to mean 'communications'. For Isis-worship at Cnidus cf. Drexler, *Num. Zeitschr.* xxi. 124-5, and for Isis-worship at Cyrene cf. Hdt. iv. 186, who says that out of respect for her the women of Cyrene and Barca ate no cow's flesh.

82. Δικτυνών : cf. Apul. *Metam.* xi. 5 *me primigenii Phryges Pessinunticam nominant deum matrem; hinc Autochthones Attici Cecropiam Minervam* (cf. e. g. l. 30); *illinc fluctuantes Cyprii* (cf. ll. 86-8) *Paphiam Venerem* (cf. e. g. l. 9); *Cretes sagittiferi Dictynniam Dianam* (cf. l. 84); *Siculi trilingues Stygiam Proserpinam* (cf. l. 72, note); *Eleusini vetustam* (cf. ll. 37-8, note) *deam Cererem; Iunonem* (cf. l. 26, note) *alii, Bellonam* (cf. l. 83, note) *alii, Hecatam* (cf. l. 113) *isti, Rhamnusia illi; et qui nascentis dei Solis inchoantibus illustrantur radiis Aethiopes Ariique, priscaque doctrina pollentes Aegyptii . . . appellant vero nomine reginam* (cf. e. g. l. 36) *Isidem*. Dictynnis was another name of Britomartis; cf. Diod. v. 76, and Rapp in Roscher, *op. cit.* i. 821-8. The usual form was Δικτυννα.

83. Θέμιν : cf. Πραξι[δ]ι[κ]η[ν] in l. 50.

στρατίαν : the title is appropriate enough at Rome (cf. ll. 71, 102, 239-42, and 82, note), but the reading is not certain, for the first letter is more like *a* than *σ* and the cross-bar of *τ* is very low, while the vertical stroke comes down further than usual, unless what looks like the bottom of it belongs to the *η* of τριφυήν in the next line. Ἄτροφιον (a variant of Ἄτροπον?) or Ἄ(σ)τραψιον (a form quoted by Suidas, s. v. μαρμαρυγή) is possible; cf. for the latter l. 238. On Isis-worship at Rome, which was firmly established in the time of Sulla, see Drexler in Roscher, *op. cit.* 400-9, Lafaye, *op. cit.*

84. τριφυής is new as an epithet of Isis, and what it refers to is not clear. Perhaps it means much the same as τριμορφος, which was an epithet of Hecate (l. 113; cf. l. 91 τριοδίτης). Mr. Milne suggests a connexion with the three-faced goddess figured on the leaden tokens of Memphis (*Ancient Egypt*, 1915. 108). For τριφυήν cf. l. 130 εὐπρ[ε]πήν.

85. [Π]άθμω : an island is expected, and [.]εμφ, which can be read, does not provide a suitable name, so that Patmos seems to be meant. The spelling may be due to the likeness to the Παθμικὸν στόμα (Ptol. iv. 5) which others call Φατνικόν.

νέα μ. [.]ιθ[.]κη : the writer changes in ll. 85-6 from the accusative to the nominative, as again in ll. 107-9. ν of νέα is very uncertain, but the space suits νέα (cf. ὠραία in l. 90) better than θέα. The second word is not μο[ν]σε[ι]κή or [γ]ραμμ[α]τε[ι]κή (cf. l. 123), but the doubtful ι might be ν, and the θ possibly ε.

86. For evidence of Isis-worship in Cyprus (cf. ll. 87-9) see Apul. *Metam.* xi. 5 quoted in l. 82, note, and Drexler, *op. cit.* 379-80. For δία cf. ll. 26 and 111, and for ἡπία l. 11. δίαν cannot be read, but κεννη with δ above the first ν (i. e. κενδήν : cf. l. 79) is possible instead of ἡπία.

87. Diox is inserted between two places in Cyprus. For evidence of Isis-worship there see Drexler, *op. cit.* 381-2. στείχουσα as the title of a deity seems to be new.

κατόπτιν : cf. P. Brit. Mus. 46. 280-1 τῶν ἐπερωτώντων με καὶ κατ' ὄψιν μοι ἐρχομένων.

88. πανάφθονος is a new compound; cf. εὐπλέαν in l. 99.

89-90. The preceding mention of Cyprus and the occurrence of south Syrian towns in ll. 93 sqq. make it probable that both Chalcidice and Pieria refer to the districts in north Syria (Pieria on the coast, Chalcidice inland near Belus), rather than the homonymous districts in Macedonia, which would more naturally have occurred in proximity to the places mentioned in ll. 107-14. Petra, however, might be in the Macedonian Pieria; cf. note on l. 91. [δ]σίαν might be read for [ἀ]γίαν, but cf. e. g. l. 34. Συρ[ε]α is inadmissible in l. 90.

90. Ἀσία, if right (Ἰωνία is unsuitable), probably means Asia Minor rather than the Roman

province of Asia or Asia in general. On Isis-worship in Asia Minor cf. Drexler, *Num. Zeitschr.* xxi. 1 sqq.

91. *τριοδέτιν*: usually an epithet of Hecate; cf. l. 113 Ἐκά[τ]η and l. 84 *τριφυήν*.

Πέτρας: about fifteen towns of this name are known. That in the Macedonian Pieria (Livy, xxxix. 26) might be meant (cf. ll. 89–90, note); but the Arabian Petra (*Wadi Músa*) was the most important and, as ll. 93 sqq. are concerned with Syria, was probably intended, although Arabia occurred in l. 77.

92. Ὑψηλή: the capital of an Upper Egyptian nome (Ptol. iv. 5) is unsuitable, but the Ὑψηλίται described by Steph. Byz. as κατοικία Θράκης may be connected with this Ὑψ. An unknown place in Arabia or Syria, however, may well be meant; cf. ll. 93 sqq.

93. Ῥεινοκορούλοις: *El Arish*; cf. l. 74, note. There is much variation in the spelling of this name, which occurs elsewhere as Ῥινοκόρουρα or Ῥινοκόλουρα. 1380 is certainly incorrect on this point.

παντόπ[τιν]: cf. l. 87 *κατόπτιν*, but *παντοπ[όρον]* can be read. The second π has perhaps been corrected from ι or ρ.

94. Dora (*Tantura*) was between Ptolemaïs (l. 117) and Στράτωνος Πύργος in Palestine. The latter town was the earlier name of Caesarea (Joseph. *Arch.* xv. 8. 5), and is found in Strabo, p. 758, while Ptolemy calls it *Καيسάρεια Στράτωνος*. It was situated between Dora and Ascalon (l. 96) and is still called *Kaisarîa*.

95. Ἑλλάδα: for the personification of Hellas in art cf. Drexler in Roscher, *op. cit.* i. 2027–8. She has no special attributes. That Isis should be regarded not far from Egypt as a specifically Greek deity is noticeable; cf. her title *Δατῖνα* among the Persians (l. 104 and p. 192).

96. Ascalon (*Askalan*) was north of Gaza (l. 99) and south of Στράτωνος Πύργος (l. 94). Sinope (*Sinub*), which was on the north coast of Paphlagonia, is out of place among these Syrian towns. The statue of Sarapis was said to have been brought to Egypt from Sinope; cf. Plut. *De Is. et Os.* 28.

97. *πολυώνυμον*: cf. introd. and Drexler, *op. cit.* 546–7.

Ῥαφέα: the usual spelling is Ῥαφία or Ῥαφεία. *Rîfa* is between Rhinocolura (l. 93) and Gaza (l. 99).

98. ἐν Τριπόλει ὀρθωσίαν: cf. l. 225, where the mention of the river Eleutherus shows that *Tarabliis* on the Syrian coast north of Berytus (l. 116), not Tripolis in the Cyrenaica, is meant. A town called Orthosia between *Τριπ.* and the Eleutherus is mentioned by Strabo, pp. 753–4. For ὀρθωσία cf. l. 39, note.

99. Γάζη: *Gazza*, a little south of Ascalon (l. 96).

εὐπλέαν: *εὐπλειος* occurs in Hom. ρ 467, but *εὐπλεος* nowhere else. θ might be read for the first ε and ι for υ, and the fourth letter may be lost altogether; but cf. ll. 88 *πανάφθονον*, 135 *εὐθηρίαν*. That *εὐπλέαν* is a corruption of *εὐπλοιαν* (cf. l. 74 *ὀρμίστριαν*) is hardly likely.

Δελφοῖς: no Isis-temple at Delphi itself is known, but Tithora in Phocis had one; cf. Pausan. x. 32. 9 and Drexler, *op. cit.* 387–8.

100. Βαμβύκη (*Bambúk*) was an ancient town east of Antioch and twenty-four miles from the Euphrates. For the worship there of Atargatis (a form of Astarte; cf. l. 116) cf. Pliny, *N. H.* v. 81 *Bambycen quae alio nomine Hierapolis vocatur, Syris vero Mabog (ibi prodigiosa Atargatis, Graecis autem Derceto dicta colitur)*. For other identifications of Isis with Atargatis see Drexler, *op. cit.* 500. The usual forms are Ἀτάργατις or Ἀταργάτη, and -τει here is probably a mistake for -τη (cf. l. 106, note), i. e. the nominative; cf. l. 107, note. At Oxyrhynchus the cult of this goddess occurs in a papyrus to be published in Part XII.

101. [κ]ἄν Δήλῳ: cf. l. 114. Delos inscriptions frequently mention Isis.

102. Ἀμάζοις: i. e. Ἀμαζόσι. *Amadouis* (i. e. Ἀμαδό(κο)ις) might be read, but *στρατίαν* (cf. l. 83) suits the Amazons, who were regarded as historical even in late times.

103. India and the Ganges are mentioned in l. 226. That Isis-worship penetrated there was not known previously. For Isis in Thessaly cf. Drexler, *op. cit.* 387.

104. *σελήνην*: for the common identification of Isis with the moon, which some Egyptologists consider to be a non-Egyptian idea, cf. Diod. i. 25 and Drexler, *op. cit.* 437-8.

Λατείνην: this title, which suggests that the Persians learnt Isis-worship from the Romans, not the Egyptians, is curious; cf. 'Ελλάδα in l. 95.

105. For *Κόρην* cf. l. 72, note. *Θαψ[ε]ύσιον* or *Ταψ*. (cf. the critical note; the missing letter is quite uncertain) seems to be the equivalent of a Persian appellation; cf. p. 192. Traces of Isis-worship among the Parthians are known; cf. Drexler, *op. cit.* 379.

106. For *Ναίαν* or *Να(α)ίαν* (cf. the critical note) cf. *Ἴσις Ναναία* at Nabla in the Arsinoite nome (P. Brit. Mus. 345. 3) and the *Ναναίον* at Alexandria (e.g. 34. ii. 6). Nanai was an old Babylonian goddess of fertility, identified with Artemis (cf. l. 84), and had a celebrated temple near Susa; cf. 2 Macc. i. 13 and Wagner in Roscher, *op. cit.* iii. 4-5.

Φοίνικι Συρίας: *Φοίνικη* would be expected (cf. e.g. Ptol. v. 14. 3), but *Φοῖνιξ* occurs as a place-name, and the form was perhaps intentional, though incorrect; cf. l. 100, note.

107. *θεός*: cf. l. 77, note, and for the case, which continues up to l. 109, ll. 85-6.

Σαμοθράκη: this island was the chief centre of the mysteries of the Cabiri, with which Isis may have been connected in Roman times.

108. For Isis-worship at Pergamum cf. Drexler, *Num. Zeitschr.* xxi, p. 55.

109. *ἀ[γά]πην θεῶν*: cf. l. 28 *ἀγάπην* [...]. The first letter might be λ, but λ[ύ]πην does not suit the space. On the extensive evidence for Isis-worship in Italy as well as Rome (l. 83) see Lafaye, *op. cit.*, Drexler in Roscher, *op. cit.* 397-412. She had a temple at Pompeii.

110. *Σάμφ*: for evidence of Isis-worship there from coins and inscriptions see Drexler, *op. cit.* 381.

111. *μύστειν*: cf. the Ios inscr. 27 *ἐγὼ μύησεις ἀνθρώποις ἀνέδειξα*.

Μύνδφ: on the Carian coast, ten miles north-west of Halicarnassus. The head-dress of Isis appears on coins of Myndus; cf. Drexler, *Num. Zeitschr.* xxi. 130.

112. *Ἑλένην*: cf. Hdt. ii. 113-20, Plut. *De Herod. malig.* 12, who states that Menelaüs and Helen received *πολλὰι τιμαί* in Egypt, and Engelmann in Roscher, *op. cit.* i. 1949-52. For Isis-worship in Bithynia cf. Drexler, *Num. Zeitschr.* xxi. 23.

ἡλίου ὄνομα: cf. e.g. 'eye of the sun' in the Egyptian titles of Isis (Brugsch, *Religion*, 645), and ll. 157-9. *ὄμμα* is inadmissible.

113. *Ἐκά[τ]η*: cf. l. 91 *τριοδεῖτιν* and l. 84 *τριφυήν*. For Isis-worship in Caria cf. Drexler, *op. cit.* 119.

114-15. *Δινδύμη* implies that the writer considered *Δινδυμα* to be a feminine singular instead of neuter plural. *τ[ρι]β[ί]αν* could be read in l. 114, but the Latin form is not suitable here (cf. l. 91) and *τ[υμ]β[ί]αν* is unsatisfactory, so that probably the word is a foreign name, like the next. The ε of *εν* in l. 115 is not enlarged, as is generally the case with *εν* in a new clause, and there is no trace of a stop before it; but *εν Τρύ[φ]* for *Τύρ[φ]* (the absence of which town is remarkable), or *εν Τρύ[α]* for *Τροί[α]* could be read, making *-παλ* the termination of the preceding name. If not ρ, the letter following τ can only be ο: the next might be α, δ, or λ. For Isis-worship in the Troad cf. Drexler, *Num. Zeitschr.* xxi. 59. *ἀβίβαστον* = *ἀβατον* occurs elsewhere only in an ancient gloss; cf. Stephanus, *Thesaurus*.

116-17. Berytus (*Beirut*), Sidon (*Saida*), and Ptolemaïs (*Akka*) were between Tripolis (l. 98) and Ascalon (l. 96). For Isis-Astarte in Syria cf. Drexler in Roscher, *op. cit.* 500 and l. 100, note. For *φρονίμην* cf. l. 124.

118. This Susa (cf. l. 105) is apparently unknown, like the title *Σαρκοῦνις*. The *Ἐρυθρὰ θάλασσα* perhaps means the Persian Gulf (cf. Hdt. i. 180) rather than the Red Sea.

119-20. For Isis *θεσμοφόρος* cf. the Ios Inscr. 8-11 *ἐγὼ νόμους ἀνθρώποις ἐθέμην καὶ*

ἐνομοθέτησα ἃ οὐδείς δύναται μεταθεῖναι, and Drexler, *op. cit.* 459-61. What the fifteen θεσμοί were is unknown, and the two προστάγματα in l. 156 are equally obscure.

121-3. Cf. p. 193 and the Ios Inscr. 19-20 ἐγὼ θαλάσσια ἔργα εἶρα.

123-4. For γραμματική cf. p. 193, λογιστική l. 27, φρονίμη ll. 117 and 44, note.

125-6. Cf. ll. 222-6, Plut. *De Is. et Os.* 32 and 'Whose husband is the inundation of the Nile', 'Who maketh the Nile to swell in due season' in Isis' Egyptian titles (Budge, *op. cit.* 278). For π[ᾶσ]αν χώραν cf. l. 24 and note. Here, however, π[ᾶσ]αν (τὴν) χώραν (cf. l. 151), i. e. Egypt, would be more suitable.

126-7. τὸ καλὸν ζῶον: i. e. as a cow; cf. l. 107 ταυρῶπις and ll. 161-2, note.

127-8. For ἰλαρὰν ὄψιν cf. p. 193, and for μουσαναγωγόν l. 62, note.

129. πολ[ύ]φθαλμ[ο]ν: the name Osiris was considered by some to mean πολυφθαλμος according to Plut. *De Is. et Os.* 10, but wrongly; cf. Wiedemann, *op. cit.* 514.

129-32. For Isis as the model wife and mother cf. p. 193, the Ios Inscr. 29 sqq. ἐγὼ στέργεσθαι γυναῖκας ὑπὸ ἀνδρῶν ἡγάνκασα . . . ἐγὼ συγγραφέας γαμικά[s] εἶρα, and Drexler, *op. cit.* 491. ἡδία (or ἡδεια) seems to be otherwise unattested.

133. βό[σ]τρυχον: the metaphorical use of this word is new and probably represents an ancient Egyptian expression; a lock of hair characterizes many representations of Harpocrates (cf. ll. 135-6, note). But possibly the meaning of βόστρυχος here is 'bunch of grapes', alluding to Isis' discovery of wine (ll. 179-83).

134-5. Cf. l. 51, note, and p. 193.

135-6. τὴν τῶν θεῶν Ἀρποκράτην: cf. 'the female Ra', 'the female Horus' in Isis' Egyptian titles (Budge, *op. cit.* 277). The phrase seems to mean 'the darling of the gods' and to be an adaptation from the Egyptian rather than a direct equivalent, since 'Harpocrates' means 'Horus the (male) child', and the feminine would be something like 'Hartshêris'.

137. The stop after μισεχθ[ῆ]ν is uncertain, and there might be one after πάνταρχον. μισεχθής is not found elsewhere.

138-9. πιστοῖασπιν is a curious compound. τεις τὸ ἰάσπι(ον) might be read, but, though a letter may have been lost at the end of the previous line, ἄ]γεις or ἄγεις is inadmissible. For τ instead of γ cf., however, l. 105 Μάτοις. διάδημα rather supports πιστοῖασπιν ἀνέμου in preference to πιστέ(ν) ἀσπιν ἀνέμου, or ἀσπιλίαν ἐμοῦ, which could also be read. The writer is fond of the adjective πιστός, but it does not occur elsewhere in 1380 as a title. There are no other instances of the first person, though this is naturally found in similar invocations. ἰασπιν is a known form of the accusative, but not ἀσπίν, and ἀσπίδα is correctly written in l. 58. For διάδημα cf. l. 194. 'Isis of lapis-lazuli' occurs among her titles in the demotic papyrus mentioned on p. 191.

139-41. αἱ κύνες might be read for εἰκόνες, in which case a dittography of αἱ must be supposed. A reference to the dogstar occurs in l. 144, but the Ios Inscr. 27-8 ἐγὼ ἀγάλματα θεῶν τειμᾶν ἐδίδαξα confirms εἰκόνες: cf. Diod. i. 15. If πρ in l. 141 is right, πρ[οσηγορί]ας ἔχοντα is possible, but -ι ταρ[(or τυρ) may be read for ια πρ[. χάρε[ι]τι or χάριτι is just possible, but the first letter is more like λ than α, μ, or χ.

142. κ[υρ]ία Ἰσι μ[ε]γίστη: κ[υρ]ία is very doubtful, the space being barely sufficient. The first letter of Ἰσι perhaps had a diaeresis, as in l. 23. The letter above the line (cf. the critical note) is also very uncertain: perhaps ἦ [με]γίστη should be read.

143-4. Ἰοῖ Σῶθι: for Io = Isis cf. l. 64, note. The reading seems clear. Sothis, the Egyptian name of Sirius, was identified with Isis; cf. e.g. Ἰσισῶθι as one word (nom. or voc.) among a number of magical names with which Isis is invoked in P. Brit. Mus. 121. 495, and Plut. *De Is. et Os.* 61, quoted in ll. 221-2, note.

145-6. There is a blank space before ε[πι]νοεῖς, of which the initial letter is enlarged, but apparently no stop. κ[αὶ τό in l. 144 would make that line unusually long, and ἀμέτρητον

suits κρατεῖς better than εἰ[πι]νοεῖς, for which cf. l. 173. The τ of θωτα in l. 146 is very uncertain, but καὶ πο[ιε]ῖς κ[ι]θῶνα, which can be read, is hardly satisfactory. With Isis as the inventor of weaving cf. 'weaver and fuller' in her Egyptian titles (Budge, *op. cit.* 278).

146-7. The second letter of σῶα[ς] might be α and the first and third are very doubtful. συνορμισθ[ῆν]αι is probably to be taken metaphorically (cf. the Ios Inscr. 21-2 ἐγὼ γυναικα καὶ ἄνδρα συνήγαγα. ἐγὼ γυναιξὶ δεκάμηνον βρέφος ἐνέταξα), though there seem to be no parallels for this use and ὀρμιστριαν occurs in l. 15.

148-9. This sentence apparently balances the one following. σοί has perhaps been omitted before οἱ. π[ι] can be read for η[ι] at the end of l. 148. There is not room for θύουσι, but which letter was omitted between θ and σ is uncertain.

149. ἄπασαι is very doubtful, but cf. l. 148 ἄπαντες. Possibly the second letter was μ with π written above it. ἄμαξαι (cf. Hdt. ii. 163) does not suit the traces of the fourth letter. Heracleopolis Magna is probably meant, not the Heracleopolis of l. 56.

152. ὀρῶσι makes good sense, referring to visions of Isis in dreams (cf. Drexler, *op. cit.* 522-5); but the supposed traces of letters above the line and the deletion of π are very uncertain. Perhaps ὀπως should be read, the verb being then omitted.

153-5. Probably the corrected word beginning with ε was an aorist, and τξε agrees with ἡμερῶν, such an order being common at this period. The mention of the 365 days (cf. l. 204 ἐμιαυτὸν τέλει[ον]) may be connected with the circumstance that at Saïs the 5th intercalary day, the last of the year, was the birthday festival of Isis; cf. P. Hibeh 27. 205.

155. For ἡπεία cf. ll. 11 and 86: possibly the ε was deleted. For εὐδιάλλακτος cf. P. Brit. Mus. 122. 28 εὐδιάλεκτος γενοῦ.

156. δ[ύ]ο προσταγμάτων: cf. the fifteen θεσμοί in l. 120. The traces suit δ[ύ]ο better than σ[ῶ]ν, which would moreover be superfluous after σοῦ in l. 155.

157-8. Cf. the Ios Inscr. 18-19 ἐγὼ ἡλίου καὶ σελήνης πορείαν συνέταξα.

161-2. τὰ ἄλλα ἱερά ζῶα is apparently accusative, not nominative. The ἱερά ζῶα may have included a sacred cow representing Isis, as the sacred bull at Memphis represented Apis. τῷ Ὀσίριδος ἀδύτῳ (cf. l. 216) probably refers to τὸ τοῦ Ὀσίριδος ἄστυλον ἐν ᾧ κείσθαι τὸν Ὀσιρίν φασιν, situated a little above Saïs (Strabo, p. 803). A stop is expected before ἐν τῷ or ἰλαροί.

166.] . ονται : ορ] . . ιται.

167. The last word of the line is not βασιλ[έ]α.

170. τὴν γῆν σπορίμην: Isis was especially the goddess of the fields and crops; cf. e. g. the stele quoted by Diod. i. 14 εὐροῦσα τῆς κριθῆς καρπὸν.

171. -ασα[.] is probably a verb -ασα[ς] with ἄπαντα beginning a new sentence; but -ατα[.] . [.] πάντα can be read.

173. [έ]πινοοῦσα τὴν δρόσον: cf. l. 229 and P. Leyden V. vii. 23 Ἴσις ἢ καλουμένη δρόσος, which Brugsch (*Religion*, 137) connects with the supposed origin of Isis as the morning-glow.

174. There are short blank spaces after -σον and πάντα.

175-7. Cf. ll. 194-6, and Isis as τύχη (l. 51) and νέμεσις (Drexler, *op. cit.* 544-5).

178-9. Cf. p. 193.

179-83. The punctuation is uncertain: there may have been stops after παρέσχεσ or πρῶτον and after πανηγύρισιν. In l. 180 παντός can be read and]α[ς] or]ο[ν] before παρέσχεσ. It is not certain that the two letters at the end of the line were deleted. πρῶτον in l. 181 is very dubious, and . ρος τότε is possible. In l. 182 εποπτρα, i. e. ἐπόπτρια (a late form) may have been first written (cf. κατόπτρις in l. 87), but the object of the correction (cf. the critical note) is then obscure. ευχαις (the two last letters are very doubtful) seems to be a mistake for εὐχαῖς or εὐωχίαις, but ἐπικλήσε[σι] cannot be read. Isis is not elsewhere

credited with the discovery of wine, Isis-worship according to Plut. *De Is. et Os.* 6 rather enjoining abstinence from wine.

183-6. After ψ[υχ]ρῶν there seems to be an omission of καὶ θερμῶν. That a stop is lost after συνέστηκεν is not certain, although there is a blank space; if ἐξ ὧν starts a fresh sentence connected only with what follows, there is a further omission in l. 184 of something corresponding to εὐρέτρια ἐγενήθης, but that can be avoided by connecting ἐξ ὧν with what precedes, though π[ά]των in l. 186 is then redundant.

187. σο[υ] ἐπα]νή[γ]αγες: μ[έγα]ν (cf. l. 242) ἦ[γ]αγες hardly fills up the space, but ὄσ[ε]ρι]ν ἦ[γ]. is possible. For ἐπα]νή[γ]αγες cf. l. 126 ἐπανάγουσαν.

189. ἀγ]αθοῦ δαίμονος might refer to the serpent regarded as the good genius of each nome (Renouf, *Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch.* 1890, p. 11; cf. ἀσπίς in l. 58), or possibly to the main western branch of the Nile (Ptol. iv. 5).

193-4. Either ἠῦξησας (cf. l. 237) or ἐπ]ηύξ. (cf. l. 297) or κατ]ηύξ. (cf. l. 257) can be read. ἦ[γ]ε]μονίς is very insecure; κε|.|. s is not unlikely. For διαδημάτων cf. l. 139.

194-6. Cf. ll. 175-7. [κιν]ήσεως is possible in l. 195 (cf. Plut. *De Is. et Os.* 62), but the word contrasted with it is not στάσεως.

196-7. After πα (or πλ) there seems to be a correction, but it is not clear whether the letters between πα and ν were deleted. A phrase referring to Osiris is expected (cf. ll. 188-9 and 198), but τοῦ πλέον[τος] is not satisfactory. κυ]ρία is inadmissible in l. 197.

199-200. Perhaps ἐ[ποίη]σας; cf. l. 263. A stop would be expected after it.

202-3. Ἰσ[τ]εῖα can be read; but Ἰσεῖον is the commoner form at this period. For εἰς τὸν [ἀπαν]τα χρόνον] κατ]έσ[τ]ησας cf. ll. 213-14.

203-5. For τὰ νόμιμα cf. ll. 244-5, and for ἐ]μιαυτὸν τέλ(ε)]ον cf. ll. 153-5, note.

205-6. It is not certain that there were stops after π]αρέδωκας and τόπον. The intervening words are more likely to be governed by π]αρέδωκας than by ἔδειξας in l. 207.

206-7. Perhaps ἐν πάντει τόπ[ῳ] κατ]έδειξας (cf. l. 178), the object being ὅτι σὺ κτλ.

209. [π]ᾶν can be read at the beginning of the line, but not [π]αρὰ σοῦ.

210. The letter before ωνα can well be μ, but Ἄμμωνα hardly fills up the space. πο[τ]αμῶν (cf. l. 223) ἀπ[α]ντή is also unsuitable. For Horus-Apollo cf. ll. 246-7, note. The general sense of ll. 209-14 is parallel to that of ll. 262-8.

212. κ[. . .]: perhaps κ[ατὰ].

213. The stop after [πᾶ]σαν seems to be superfluous.

214-16. Cf. Diod. i. 27, who connects the high position of women in Egypt with Isis, and e. g. the alternative names of one of the nomes Γυναικοπολίτης and Ἀνδροπολίτης (l. 21, note).

216. For ἀδύτῳ cf. ll. 162 and 249. The following letter can be η, κ, or π.

217.]οραν suggests φθ]οράν (cf. ll. 175 and 195), but]ορον can be read.

218. Possibly βασιλισσα Ἥρα: cf. e. g. l. 34. At the end of the line κυρι is all that is visible, and as there is no special trace of the surface being damaged, perhaps κυρί(α) should be read. There is however no other instance in 1380 of a participle beginning a fresh sentence.

219. Perhaps [ἐπὶ σ]οῦ: cf. l. 269.

220. πτέρυξ[ε]ν: cf. ll. 65-6, note.

221-2. The supposed vestige of κ after τό can be a diaeresis over ι or ν. For Horus in connexion with the sun cf. l. 233 and Plut. *De Is. et Os.* 61 ἐν δὲ ταῖς Ἑρμοῦ λεγομέναις βίβλοις ἱστοροῦσι γεγράφθαι . . . ὅτι τὴν μὲν ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ ἡλίου περιφορᾶς τεταγμένην δύναμιν ὠρον, Ἕλληνες δ' Ἀπόλλωνα καλοῦσι τὴν δ' ἐπὶ τοῦ πνεύματος οἱ μὲν Ὀσιριν οἱ δὲ Σάραπιν οἱ δὲ Σωθί (cf. l. 144) Αἰγυπτιστί.

222-6. Cf. ll. 121-3 and 125-6. ἐπα]νάγει (cf. ἐπανάγουσαν in l. 126) is inadmissible in

l. 224. The Eleutherus (cf. l. 98, note) was quite a small river, and that it should be placed on the same level of sanctity as the Nile and Ganges is remarkable.

227. ἐνκερ . . . ἔστιν: the doubtful ρ may be ι. εν may be ἔν. There is a short blank space after ἔστιν, but apparently no stop. χερσαῖον cannot be read.

230. Whether γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης depend on λ[.]σε[ω]ς or are coupled with it is not clear; λ[ύ]σε[ω]ς in the sense of 'breaking' is not satisfactory.

232.]as is probably the termination of a verb, but ηῦξ[ησ]as (cf. l. 193) is unsuitable. There perhaps ought to have been a stop at the end of the line.

233-4. Cf. ll. 221-2. In l. 234 απο might be read at the beginning of the line, and πλείονα ὦραν (or -ras) πᾶν ὄρος (not πρὸς) further on.

235. The Dioscuri, though frequently associated with Sarapis on Alexandrian coins, are not known to have been specially connected with Isis; but they like her were protectors of travellers by sea, and Isis was a goddess of the stars; cf. l. 159, and Drexler, *op. cit.* 435.

237-9. Cf. ll. 138 and 227-30.

239-42. For the insertion of τυράννουσ proposed in the critical note cf. the Ios Inscr. 29 ἐγὼ τυράννω[ν] ἀρχὰς κατέλυσα.

242-3. For Isis making Osiris immortal cf. ll. 13 and 246-7, notes.

244-5. Cf. ll. 203-4.

246-7. ἀθάνατον ἐποίησας is to be supplied from l. 243. On the immortality conferred by Isis on Horus cf. Diod. i. 25. τ[ῆ]ς [μητρ]ός is possible in l. 246, but the doubtful ο may be ω. Diodorus (*l. c.*) says τὸν δὲ Ὀρον μεθερμηνευμένον φασιν Ἀπόλλωνα (cf. l. 210) ὑπάρχειν καὶ τὴν τε ἰατρικὴν καὶ τὴν μαντικὴν ὑπὸ τῆς μητρὸς Ἰσιδος διδαχθέντα διὰ τῶν χρησμῶν (cf. l. 252, note) καὶ τῶν θεραπειῶν ἐνεργετεῖν τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος.

248-9. Cf. l. 295.

249. Μέμ[φ]ι: cf. ll. 1-3, note.

250-2. αὐτοῦ is probably a corruption of αὐτὸν τοῦ πατρός, for Osiris does not seem to have been mentioned since l. 242 and cf. l. 263 sqq. διάδοχον αὐτ[δ]ν ἐποίησ[as] . . . ἐπὶ τοῦ πατρῖου οἴκου.

252. χρησ[μ]φ[δ.] can refer to either Isis (cf. l. 43) or Horus (cf. l. 266).

254. Perhaps γῆ[ν] καὶ θάλα[σ]σαν: cf. l. 230.

257. Perhaps ἐ[β]ούλω[ν], contrasted with [ἀ]βουλίαις in l. 258.

263-4. Cf. ll. 250-2.

264-6. Ὀρον cannot be read in l. 264, nor does βυ in l. 265 seem to refer to Ἄβυδος (cf. l. 279). With θρόνου cf. l. 251 θρονιστής.

269-71. Cf. l. 51, note.

276. τι τη[]: or τυτη[].

278. Ἄβυδον: one of the chief reputed tombs of Osiris was there; cf. Plut. *De Is. et Os.* 20.

280-1. Cf. l. 284. ἀ]φώναντον seems to be for ἀ]φώνητον: cf. the next note.

282.]λε. εθεῦ: cf. l. 286]τααβδεῦ and l. 296]οιωεανεῦ. All three seem to be mystical names of Isis in the vocative; cf. P. Brit. Mus. 121. 493-7 and 531-7.

285. [ε]ν τῆ[]: or [ἀ]ντί.

286. Cf. l. 282, note.

291. For εἰς] τὸν αἰῶνα: cf. e. g. l. 268. τὸν [Ὀρον, followed by an adjective or substantive, is not unlikely; cf. ll. 209-14.

296. Cf. l. 282, note. ἀλ[] may well be some part of ἀλαρός: cf. ll. 127 and 162.

1381. PRAISE OF IMOUTHES-ASCLEPIUS.

21.8 × 112.5 cm.

Second century.

The verso of 1380, which is in much better condition than the recto, contains an analogous text in honour of a deity whose worship in Roman times to some extent connects through Hermes with that of Isis, namely Imouthes, the Egyptian Imhotep, identified by the Greeks with Asclepius the god of medicine. This deity stands on a somewhat different level from that occupied by most other gods of Egypt, being a historical person who came to be deified, like Amenhotp son of Hapu, a sage whose sayings were still honoured in the Graeco-Roman period, as is shown by a Theban ostrakon containing a selection of them (Wilcken, *Festschr. für G. Ebers*, pp. 142 sqq.). In the *λόγος τέλειος* of Hermes (Pseudo-Apul. 37) Asclepius is coupled with Isis and Hermes as *dii terreni et mundani*. Egyptian writings on his temples and figures made Imhotep the son of Ptah, but attributed to him a human mother and wife. He seems to have been a celebrated sage, physician, and architect, who lived in the time of King Zoser of the 3rd dynasty, as was stated by Manetho, if Sethe's convincing emendation (*Imhotep*, p. 19) of that writer's entry concerning King Zoser, as found in Africanus and Eusebius, be accepted, *Τόσορθρος ἔτη κθ' (ἐφ' οὗ 'Ιμούθης) οὗτος 'Ασκλήπιος παρὰ Αἰγυπτίους κατὰ τὴν ἰατρικὴν νερόμισται, καὶ τὴν διὰ ξεστῶν λίθων οἰκοδομίαν εὖρατο, ἀλλὰ καὶ γραφῆς ἐπεμελήθη*. His principal temple, which was on the desert-edge near Memphis, is mentioned in the Serapeum papyri, e.g. P. Leyden i, p. 77 *τοῦ πρὸς Μέμφιν μεγάλου 'Ασκληπιείου*, and his tomb was supposed to be there (Sethe, *op. cit.* p. 7), not far from the great step-pyramid which he built for Zoser; other temples to him at Thebes and Philae are known. The hieroglyphic evidence concerning Imhotep-worship comes mainly from inscriptions which are of the Ptolemaic age, though perhaps based in some cases on older material, and Sethe considers that his deification did not take place before the 26th dynasty. A. H. Gardiner (*Zeitschr. f. Aeg. Spr.* xl. 146) has pointed out that scribes were accustomed at least as early as the 18th dynasty to pour out the last drop of the water with which they mixed their ink as a libation to Imhotep. An ancient hymn, dating probably from the 11th dynasty, which couples Imhotep with Hardedef, a wise and pious prince of the 4th dynasty (cf. l. 7, note), is thought by Sethe to show that he was then regarded only as a sage. The author of 1381, however, asserts that the respect paid to Imhotep in late times was the revival of a worship encouraged or instituted by the celebrated king Mencheres

of the 4th dynasty, but such attributions of great antiquity to religious foundations have commonly little historical value ; cf. pp. 223-4.

Eleven columns, each of twenty-two or twenty-three lines, are for the most part well preserved, and few of the lacunae present serious difficulties. The author of the composition was primarily concerned with giving a paraphrase, rather than a literal translation, of an ancient Egyptian papyrus-roll concerning the worship of Imhotep, who in ll. 201-2 is called Imouthes son of Ptah, elsewhere, e. g. in ll. 228-9, Asclepius son of Hephaestus ; but the extant portion, which from internal evidence clearly comes from a point near the beginning of the work, is mainly of a prefatory character, and the actual paraphrase is not reached until Col. x. Lines 1-32 describe the circumstances attending the discovery of the roll, apparently at the temple of Imhotep at Memphis (cf. l. 4, note), in the time of Nectanebo, the last of the Pharaohs and the subject of a number of legends in the popular literature of the Graeco-Roman period, e. g. the widely spread story of his being the father of Alexander, and the tale of his dream preserved in P. Leyden U (Wilcken, *Mélanges Nicole*, 579-96). Owing to the loss of, probably, one or two columns at the outset, it is not known whether the writer stated the authority for his story about Nectanebo, which is likely in any case to have been derived from the priests of the Ἴ�σκληπιείου. The worship of Imhotep had, it appears, decayed in the troublous times preceding that monarch, and the temple was largely deserted when the king, with a view to restoring the worship on its former basis, caused an examination of an ancient roll found there to be made through his 'archidicastes', with the result that the descendants of a number of priests had posts of emolument revived for them, and the king made a large present of land to the temple. In l. 32 the author enters upon a rather long personal explanation of the reasons which had led him first to undertake and then to postpone the publication of this ancient document in the Greek language (ll. 33-64), and after three years interval to resume his work at the direct instigation of the god, who is represented as having miraculously appeared to him and his mother and cured him of a fever (ll. 64-167). After further explanations addressed to Asclepius concerning the nature of this composition in his honour (ll. 168-202), and an invocation of pious worshippers (ll. 203-18), the writer proceeds to paraphrase the contents of the roll, but at l. 247 the text breaks off soon after it had reached the really interesting point.

The principal facts which emerge from the fragmentary account of the ancient Egyptian document are that it traced Imhotep-worship back to Mencheres, i. e. *Menkaura*, the Mycerinus of Herodotus (l. 222 ; cf. ll. 28-32), and that the tomb of Imhotep is classed with those of 'Horus son of Hermes and also Caleoibis son of Apollo' as having been the object of special honours from that king

(ll. 228-34). Menkaura, the builder of the third pyramid of Gîza, was worshipped, like his more famous predecessors Cheops (*Khufu*) and Chephren (*Khafra*), in Saïte times, when scarabs with his name are common, and his piety, which was described apparently in some detail in the document with which our author is concerned, is often alluded to in Egyptian religious tales. Herodotus (ii. 129), followed by Diodorus (i. 64), contrasts his virtues with the vices of Khufu and Khafra for reasons which as regards the two latter are not clear (cf. Wiedemann, *Herodots zweites Buch*, 479); but the statements of the ancient Egyptian roll that no wars occurred in the time of Menkaura, and that the country was extremely prosperous, are in accordance with popular tradition, and whether the worship of Imhotep really dated from early times or not (cf. p. 221) that monarch is a most natural person to be associated with its institution or encouragement. The Old Empire kings were sometimes credited with composing books themselves, and from the manner in which Menkaura is connected with the βίβλος in both places in which he is mentioned it is quite possible that he was nominally the author of the roll. This was of considerable antiquity since it apparently required to be repaired by Nectanebo (ll. 24-5, note), though owing to the loss of the first column or two of 1381, in which the age of the book may well have been described, and the uncertainty attaching to the precise restoration of ll. 226-7, it is safer to suppose that the roll was, in reality at any rate, the composition of a priest. The fact that it professed to have been written under the Old Empire is, however, compatible with a date not earlier than the Saïte period, when the archaizing tendency of the age probably led to the production of much religious literature concerning the ancient kings. But so far as it goes, the evidence of 1381 favours the view that the worship of Imhotep began in the early days of Egyptian history.

The interesting mention of the tombs of Asclepius, Horus, and Caleoibis honoured by Menkaura presents several problems. The name Καλεοίβις is not found elsewhere, though Καλιβις occurs in P. Grenf. ii. 32. 7, and no known ancient Egyptian deity bears a name which suggests an identification. His father, Apollo, would naturally be the god Horus, with whom Apollo was regularly identified in Graeco-Roman times (e. g. Hdt. ii. 156, Diod. i. 25, Plut. *De Is. et Os.* 12), but the four known sons of Horus were called Hapi, Mestha, Qebhsenuf, and Duamutf. Another difficulty arises from the mention of Horus son of Hermes (i. e. Thoth), who is distinguished from Apollo. Horus in late times (and probably in early times as well) was uniformly regarded as the son of Osiris, and it is remarkable, if Horus here is the ordinary deity of that name, that no legends about his tomb appear to be known, although Isis was sometimes supposed to have been buried at Memphis (cf. 1380. 1-3, note), and many towns

claimed to possess the tomb of Osiris. Unless Apollo here means some other god than Horus, which is unlikely, there would seem to be only two suitable explanations of the distinction between Horus son of Hermes and Apollo. Either Horus son of Hermes was a deified man on the same level as Imhotep, being earlier than the 4th dynasty and the reputed son of a god, in which case he and Horus = Apollo have nothing to do with each other; or else of the various local legends out of which the Horus-gods grew (cf. Budge, *op. cit.* i. 466 sqq.), two different myths are here associated, one making him a deified man (Horus son of Thoth), who had a tomb, the other placing him on a level with Ptah and Thoth and assigning to him a son Caleoibis, who in any case is likely to have been a deified man like Imhotep rather than an ordinary god. In support of the second view may be urged the somewhat similar conflict of testimony about Thoth, who under the title Ἑρμῆς ὁ Θεβαῖος was coupled by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* i. 21) with Ἀσκληπίος ὁ Μεμφίτης as an example of a deified man. Sethe (*op. cit.* 9) connects Ἑρμῆς ὁ Θεβαῖος with the Theban temple of 'Thoth-Teos, the ibis', who, he thinks, was a deified high-priest of Memphis; but this explanation is somewhat doubtful, particularly with regard to Clement's Hermes; cf. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, 118 sqq. In view of the many forms taken by Horus-worship and the antiquity claimed for this Egyptian roll in 1381 we prefer to interpret 'Horus son of Hermes' as the ordinary Horus, and regard the reference to the tombs of Asclepius, Horus, and an unknown Caleoibis, all in connexion with a 4th dynasty king, as another proof of the early character of the source whence this tradition was derived.

That part of the preface which deals with the writer's personal affairs and occupies the bulk of 1381 incidentally throws a few sidelights on Imhotep-worship. The expression ταύτης (sc. γραφῆς) εὐρετής applied to him in ll. 187-8 is in keeping with the statements of Manetho (cf. p. 221) and an author quoted by Stobaeus, *Ecl. phys.* i. 41, who says that Asclepius invented ποιητική as well as ἰατρική. The invocation to pious worshippers (ll. 203-15) represents him not only in his usual character of healer of diseases, protector of physicians, and general benefactor, but also as specially concerned with the pursuit of virtue, and as the protector of seafarers, a function generally performed by Isis or the Dioscuri. With regard to the writer himself it is clear from ll. 145-51 that he was not a priest, and in none of his references to the healing art is there any indication that he was a physician. Where he lived is not stated; probably his home was at Memphis near the Ἀσκληπιεῖον (cf. ll. 70-3, 145-51, and p. 221). From his assertion in ll. 170-4 that he had previously composed a 'physical' treatise on the creation of the world, and the passage in which he addresses Asclepius as διδάσκαλος in connexion with his composition (ll. 181-98), he seems to have been

by profession a literary man, with a knowledge of ancient Egyptian (ll. 32-5) and interested in mythology, being probably familiar with the works of the later Greek sophists and early writers of romances, as is indicated by his florid style and fondness for semi-poetical expressions and rare compounds, such as ἀκεσώδυνος and ἀλλαττόλογος. The date of the MS. shows that the composition of the work took place not later than the early part of the second century, and it may belong, like that of 1380, to the first; but it was probably at least two centuries later than Pap. V of Leyden (second century B. C.) and not far removed from the age of Aristides, whose oration εἰς Ἀσκληπίου covers different ground from that of 1381, and Apuleius, who, like Aristides, flourished under the Antonines. Apuleius composed a treatise *De mundo* which is extant, an address in honour of Aesculapius which is lost, and a dialogue and hymn in honour of the same god, partly in Greek partly in Latin, of which an extract from the preface is preserved in his *Flor.* 18, and an extant Latin translation of the Greek dialogue between Hermes Trismegistus and Asclepius was attributed to him. If any of his Greek treatises had survived, the style would very likely have shown several of the same characteristics as that of 1381, though the rhetorical description of the appearance of Asclepius in ll. 91-140 was perhaps more on a level with the compositions of persons who had been cured at the Serapeum of Canopus, to which Strabo alludes in p. 801 ξυγγράφουσι δέ τινες καὶ τὰς θεραπείας, ἄλλοι δὲ ἀρετὰς τῶν ἐνταῦθα λογίων (cf. 1382), than with the highly elaborated description of the appearance of Isis to Lucius in *Metam.* xi or Aristides' account of his visions of Asclepius in the *ἱεροὶ λόγοι*.

The text of 1381 is not very accurate and bears no trace of a systematic revision. The only interlinear addition concerns the spelling of *Μευχορήους*, ε being written above η in a hand which may be different from that of the main text but is more likely to be the same. A number of small omissions occur and the construction of several sentences breaks down, though it is not always certain that this was the scribe's fault; cf. ll. 24-5, 59, 97, 129-30, 136, 222, and 226-8, notes. Pauses in the sense are sometimes indicated by blank spaces, which also sometimes appear, owing to roughness of the surface, in other positions. A single (medial) stop is found in l. 167, but no other diacritical marks except diaeresis. The papyrus is referred to in the notes as Π.

Col. i.

[.]γ τὰ[ὐτ]ὰ ἀκούσας ὁ Νε[κτε-
[νε]ῖβις καὶ παροξυνθεὶς [σ]φό-
δρα μὲν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀποστατ[ο]ῦ-
σιν τοῦ ἱεροῦ, βουλόμεν[ο]ς

Col. ii.

σαν ἐκάστῳ π[ροφ]ητεῖαν. οὐ
μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ [.]π[οιή]σας τὴν
25 βίβλον ἀναν[εώ]σσεως αὐτὸν
Ἄ[σ]κλήπιον [ἐπλο]ύτισεν ἄλ-

5 δὲ ἐξ ἀναγραφῆς τὸ πλη[θ]ος αὐ-
 τῶν ἐπικρεῖναι θᾶτ[τ]ον, πα-
 ρεκελεύετο Νεχαύτι [τ]ῷ διέ-
 ποντι τότε τὴν ἀρχιδ[ι]κ[ασ]τ[ε]ί-
 αν ἔραυναν τῆς βίβλου μῆ(νὶ)
 10 ἐνὶ μάλιστα ποιήσασθαι. ὁ δὲ
 ἐκτενέστερον αὐτὴν ἀναξη-
 τήσας ἐκόμισε τῷ βασιλεῖ,
 δ[ύ]ο [ἀν]τὶ τριάκοντα ἡμερῶν
 μόνον ἀναλώσας εἰς τὴν
 15 [ς]ήτησιν. ἀναγνοὺς δὲ ὁ βασι-
 [λε]ὺς πανὸ μὲν ἠγάσθη ἐπὶ
 τῷ τῆς ἱστορίας θείῳ, ἐξ δὲ
 καὶ εἴκοσι εὐρῶν ἱερεῖς [τ]οὺς
 ἀπὸ Ἑλίου πόλεως προπ[ο]μ-
 20 πεύσαντας τὸν θεὸν εἰς τῆ[ν]
 Μέμφιν ἀπένειμεν αὐτῶν
 τοῖς ἐγγόνοις τὴν προ[σ]ήκου-

λα[ι]ς πυροφόροις ἀρούραις τρια-
 κοσίαις τριάκοντα, καὶ μάλ[ι-]
 στα ἀκούσας διὰ τῆς βίβλου
 30 τὸν θεὸν ὑπὸ Μενχορέου[ς]
 [εἰ]ς μέγεθος ἡσκημένον σε-
 [β]ασμῶν. ἐγὼ δὲ πολλάκις τῆς
 [α]ὐτῆς βίβλου τὴν ἐρμηνείαν
 [ἀρ]ξάμενος Ἑλληνίδι γλ[ώ]σση
 35 [ἔμ]αθον ὃν αἰῶνι κηρῦξαι, καὶ
 ἐν μέσῃ ρεύων τῇ γραφῇ
 ἐπεσχέθη τὴν προθυμίαν
 τῷ τῆς ἱστορίας [[τῶ]] μεγέθει,
 δ[ι]ότι ἔξω ἐλεῖν ἔμελλο[ν] αὐ-
 40 τήν. θε[ο]ῖ[ς] γὰρ μόνοι[ς] ἀλλ' οὐ
 [θν]ητοῖς ἐ[[φ]]φικ[[. .]]τ[ὸ]ν τὰς θε-
 ῶν διηγεῖσθα[ι] δυνάμεις. οὐ
 γὰρ ἀποτυχό[ν]τι μοι μόνον
 αἰδῶς ἦν πρὸς ἀνδρῶν ἀλλὰ

4. ἱεροῦ Π. 18. ἱερεῖς Π. 24-5. 1. τῆς βίβλου ἀναν[έω]σιν? above η. 35. 1. ἐν for ον. 38. ἱστορίας Π, a being corrected.

30. Second ε of μενχορεου[ς]

Col. iii.

45 καὶ ἐκώλυσέ [με τ]ὰ κατιό[ν]τα . . .]
 δια ἀγανακτήσαντος [καὶ ἀθα-
 νάτου ἀρετῆς αὐτοῦ τ[ὸ] τῆς γρ]α-
 φῆ[ς] σ[υ]νπληρουμέν[η]ς τ[α]πεί-
 νωμα, ὀφελήσαντι ὁ [] ἐ ὁ βί[ο]ς
 50 μὲν εὐδαίμων, ἡ δὲ [] φήμη
 [ἀ]θάνα[τ]ος. ἐτοιμότε[]ρος γὰρ ὁ
 θεὸς πρὸ[ς] ε[ὐε]ργεσία[]ν εἴ γε καὶ
 τοὺς αὐτ[ί]κα μόνον εὐ[]σεβεῖς
 τῇ προθυμίᾳ πολλά[]κισ ἀπην-
 55 δηκυῖης τῆς ἱατρικ[]ῆς πρὸς
 τὰς κατεχούσας αὐτοῦ[]ς νόσους

Col. iv.

σκ[ή]ψασα ἄθεος τεταρταία ἡ
 φρεῖκη αὐτὴν ἐστρόβει, ὄψε
 70 μόλις νοήσαντες ἰκέτ[α]ι πα-
 ρῆμεν ἐπὶ τὸν θεὸν τῇ (μ)ητρὶ []
 ὠμενοι ἄκεσιν ἐπινεύσαι
 τῆς νόσου. ὁ δ' οἶα καὶ πρὸς πάν-
 τας χρηστὸς δι' ὄνειράτων
 75 φανείς εὐτελέσιν αὐτὴν
 ἀπήλλαξεν βοηθήμασιν,
 ἡμεῖς δὲ [[μη]] τὰς εὐικυίας
 δ[ι]ὰ θυσιῶν τῷ σώσαντι
 ἀπεδίδομεν χάριτας. ἐπεὶ

ἔσωσεν. ὄθεν φυγῶν [τὸ ρ]εἰψοκίν-
 δυνον [εἰ]ς καιρὸν ἐτ[]ήρουν
 τὸν τοῦ <γ>ήρ[ο]υς, ἀνε[β]α[]λλό[μ]ην <δὲ>
 60 τὴν ὑπόσχεσιν. τότε []ε γὰ[ρ] μά-
 λιστα περισσόν τι τῆ[]ν ἡλικίαν
 φρονεῖν πέφυκε, τ[]α χὺ γὰρ ἡ
 νε[ότ]ης καὶ ἐφ[ορ]μῆ φ[]θάνει
 ὀρέγουσα τὴν προθυ[μ]ί[]αν. ἐπεὶ
 65 δὲ τ[ρ]ιετῆς πα[ρ]ώχητ[ο] χρόνος
 μ[ηδ]ὲν ἔτι μ[ο]υ κάμν[]οντος,
 τρ[ι]ετῆς δ[ὲ . .] τῆ μητ[]ρι ἐπι-

80 δὲ κάμοι μετὰ ταῦτα αἰφνί-
 δι[ο]ν ἄλγημα κατὰ δεξιού
 ἐρύη πλευροῦ, ταχὺς ἐπὶ
 τὸν βοηθὸν τῆς ἀνθρω-
 πίνης ὤ[ρ]μησα φύσεως,
 85 [καὶ] πάλιν ἐτοιμότερος
 ὑπακούσας εἰς ἔλεον
 [ἐ]νεργέστε[ρ]ον τὴν ἰδίαν
 ἀπεδείξατο εὐεργεσίαν,
 ἣν ἐπαληθειῶ μέλλων
 90 τὰς αὐτοῦ φρικτὰς δυ-

Π. 49. 1. ὠφελήσαντι. 54-5. ἀπηϋδηκῆς της ἰατρικης Π. 59. 1. <γ>ήρως. 70. ἴκειται Π. 77. μῆ
 α of τας CORR. from ε. 86. υ of υπακουσας CORR. 87. ἴδιαν Π.

Col. v.

ν[ά]με[ι]ς ἀπαγγέλλειν. νὺξ
 ἦν ὅτε πᾶν [ἐ]κεκοίμητο
 ζῶον πλὴν τῶν ἀλγ[ο]ύν-
 των, τὸ δὲ θεῖον ἐνεργέ-
 95 στερον ἐφαίνετο, καὶ με
 σφοδρὸς ἔφλεγε πυρ(ε)τός, ἄσθμα-
 τί τε καὶ βηκί τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ
 πλευρ[οῦ] ἀναγόμεν[η]ς ὀδύ-
 νης ἐσφαδαίζον· καρῆβα-
 100 ρηθεῖς [δ]ὲ τοῖς πόνοις {ἀ}λή-
 θαργος [εἰ]ς ὑπνον ἐφερό-
 μην· [ἡ] δὲ μήτηρ ὡς ἐπὶ
 παιδί, κα[ὶ] φύ[σ]ει φιλόστοργος
 γάρ ἐστιν, ταῖς ἐμαῖς ὑπερ-
 105 αλγ[ο]ῦσα βασάνοις ἐκαθέ-
 ζετο μηδὲ καθ' ὀλίγον ὑπνου
 μετ[α]λαμβάνουσα. εἶτ' ἐξαπ[ί]-
 νης ἑώρα—οὔτ' ὄναρ οὔθ' ὑ-
 πνος, ὀφθαλμοὶ γὰρ ἦσαν

Col. vi.

δέ[ο]υς εἰσῆει φαντασία[[ν]],
 καὶ ἀκό[π]ως κατ[ο]πτεύειν
 115 κωλύουσα εἴτε αὐτὸν τὸν
 θεὸν εἴτε αὐτοῦ θεράπον-
 τας. πλὴν ἦν τις ὑπερμή-
 κης μὲν ἢ κατ' ἀνθρω-
 πον λαμπ[ρ]αῖς ἡμφιεσμέ-
 120 νος ὀθόναις τῆ εὐωνύ-
 μῳ χειρὶ φέρων βίβλον,
 ὃς μόνον ἀπὸ κεφαλ[ῆ]ς
 ἕως ποδῶν δις καὶ τρ[ί]ς
 ἐπισκοπήσας με ἀφανῆς
 125 ἐγ[έ]νετο. ἡ δὲ ἀνανήψασα
 ἔτι τρομώδης ἐγείρειν με
 ἐπειράτο. εὐροῦ[σ]α δέ με
 τοῦ μὲν [π]υρετοῦ ἀπηλ[λ]α-
 γμένον [ί]δρῶτα δέ μοι πολ-
 130 λοῦ ἐπαπ[ο]λισθάνοντος
 τὴν μέ[ν] τοῦ θε[ο]ῦ προσε-

110 ἀκείνητοι διηनुγμένοι,
βλέποντες μὲν οὐκ ἀκρει-
βῶς, θ[.]εία γὰρ αὐτὴν μετὰ

κύνησε[ν] ἐπιφάνειαν, ἐ-
μὲ δὲ ἀπ[ο]μάσσουσα ν[η]φα-
λιώτε[ρο]ν ἐποίησεν. καὶ

135 διαλα[λή]σαντί μοι τὴν τοῦ

99. εσφραδαῖζον Π.
ἐπαπ[ο]λισθάνοντα.

108. ο of onar corr. from α.

110. ι. διηνοιγμένοι.

129-30. ι. μου πολὺν

Col. vii.

θεοῦ πρ[οε]λομένη μηνύειν ἀρε-
τὴν προλαβὼν ἐγὼ πάντα ἀ-
πήγγελον αὐτῇ· ὅσα [γ]ὰρ δι[ὰ] τῆς
ὄψεως εἶδεν ταῦτα ἐγ[ὼ] δι' ὁ-
140 νειράτων ἐφантаσιώθην.
καὶ τῶνδε τῆς πλευρᾶς λωφη-
σάντων μοι ἀλγηδόνων, ἔτι
μοι μί[α]ν δοντὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἀκε-
σώδυνον ἰατρείαν, ἐκήρυσσον
145 αὐτοῦ [τ]ὰς εὐεργεσίας. πάλιν δ' ἡ-
μῶν ταῖς κατὰ δύναμιν αὐτὸν
ἐξευμενισαμένων θυ[σ]ίαις
αὐτὸς ἀπήτει διὰ [τ]οῦ ἐν ἀγνείαις
αὐτῷ προσπολοῦντ[ο]ς ἱερέως
150 τὴν πάλαι κατηγγελμένην αὐτῷ
ὑπόσχεσιν. ἡμεῖς δὲ μηδὲ θυ-
σιῶν μήτε ἀναθήματ[ο]ς χρε-
ώστας αὐτοὺς εἰδότες ὅμως
τού[το]ις αὐτὸν πάλιν ἱκετεύ-
155 ομ[ε]ν. ὡς [δ'] οὐ τούτοις πο[λ]λάκις
εἶπε[ι]ν ἠδεσθαι ἀλλὰ τῷ προ-
καθωμολ[ο]γημένῳ διηπό-

Col. viii.

ρ[ο]υ[ν], καὶ μόνις ταπεινοῦν-
τί μοι τοῦτο τὸ θεῖο[ν] τῆ[ς] γρα-
160 φῆς ὑπῆει με χρέος. ἐπεὶ
δ' ἄπαξ ἐπεγνώκει[ς] με [ἀ]με[[λ]]-
λεῖν, δέσποτα, τῆς θε[ί]α[ς] βί-
βλου, τὴν σὴν ἐπικαλεσάμε-
νος πρόνοιαν καὶ []πλη[[ρ]]-
165 ρωθεὶς τῆς σῆς θε[ί]ότητος
ἐπὶ τὸν τῆς ἱστορία[ς] ὥρμη-
σα θεήλατον ἄθλον. καὶ
οἶμαι κατα[πλ]ώσειν [τ]ὴν
σὴν προφη[τε]ύων ἐπίνοι-
170 αν· καὶ γὰρ [τὸ]ν τῆς κοσμο-
ποιίας πιθ[α]νολ[ο]γηθέν-
τα μῦθον ἐν ἑτέρῳ β[ί]βλω
φυσικῷ πρὸ[ς] ἀλήθειαν ἀνή-
πλωσα λόγῳ. καὶ ἐν τῇ ὄλῃ
175 γραφῇ τ[ὸ] μὲν ὕστερον προσ-
επλήρωσα, τὸ δὲ περ[ί]σσει-
ον ἀφείλον, διήγημα δὲ
που μακρολογούμ[ε]ν[ο]ς
συντόμως ἐλάλησα

144. ἰατρείαν Π.
και corr. from τ?.

145. η of ημων corr.

149. ἱερέως Π.

154. ἱκετευομ[ε]ν Π.

164. ι of

166. ἱστορία[ς] Π.

167. αθλον· Π.

168. ι. καθα[πλ]ώσειν.

170-1. κοσμο-

175. ὕστερον Π.

Col. ix.

180 καὶ ἀλλαττόλογο[ν μῦθ]ον
 ἀπαξ ἔφρασα, ὅθεν, [δέσ]ποτα,
 κατὰ τὴν σὴν εὐμ[ένει]αν
 ἀλλ' οὐ κατὰ τὴν ἐμ[ὴν φρ]ό-
 νησιν τετελεσιουρ[γ]ῆ[σ]θαι
 185 τεκμαίρομαι τὴν β[ίβλ]ον.
 τῇ γ[ὰρ] σῆ θειότητι [το]ιαύ-
 τη ἀ[ρ]μόζει γ[ρ]αφή. τ[αύτ]ης
 δ' εὐρετής, μέγιστε [θε]ῶν
 Ἀσκλήπιε καὶ διδάσ[κ]αλε,
 190 κα[ὶ] ταῖς ἀπ[άν]των δί[κ]νου-
 σαι χάρισι. [πᾶ]σα γὰρ [ἀ]να-
 θήματος ἢ [θ]υσίας δ[ω]ρεὰ
 τὸν παραυτ[ί]κα μ[ό]ν[ο]ν
 ἀκμάζει κα[ι]ρ[όν], ἔφθαρ-
 195 ται δὲ τὸν μέλλοντα, γρα-
 φῆ δὲ ἀθάνατος χάρι[ς] κα-
 τὰ καιρὸν ἀνηβάσκ[ο]υσα
 τῆ[ν] μνήμην. Ἑλλη[ν]ί[ς] δὲ
 π[ᾶ]σα γλώσσα τὴν σὴν λα-
 200 λ[ή][[. .]]σε[ι] ἱστορίαν κ[αὶ] πᾶς
 Ἑλ[λ]ην ἀνήρ τὸν τ[ο]ῦ Φθᾶ
 σεβήσεται Ἰμού[θ]ην.

200. ἱστορίαν Π.

205. εἰ of ἀσεβεις CORR. from η.

209. ἰατρικὴν Π.

215. ε of εἰς CORR.

Col. x.

σύνι[τε δε]ῦρο, [ὦ ἀν]δρες
 εὐμ[ενεῖς] κα[ὶ ἀγα]θοί, ἀπι-
 205 τε, βάσκα[νοι] κ[αὶ] ἀσεβεῖς.
 σύνι[τε], ὦ [. . .]ο[. .] . [-], ὅσοι θη-
 τεύ[σ]αντε[ς] τὸν [θ]εὸν νό-
 σω[ν] ἀπηλλάγητε, [ὄ]σοι
 τὴν ἰατρικὴν με[ταχ]ειρί-
 210 ζεσθε ἐπι[σ]τήμη[ν], ὄσοι
 πονήσετε ζηλωτα[ὶ] ἀρε-
 τῆς, ὄσο[ι] πολλῶ πληθῆι
 ἐπηύξή[θ]ητε ἀγαθῶν,
 ὄσοι κινδύνους θαλάσσης
 215 πε[ρ]ιεσώθητε. εἰς πάν-
 τα γὰρ τόπον διαπεφοίτη-
 κεν ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ δύναμις
 σωτήριος. μέλλω γὰρ αὐτοῦ
 τερατώδεις ἀπαγγέλλειν
 220 ἐπ[ι]φανείας δυνάμεως
 τε μεγέθη εὐε[ρ]γετημά-
 των (τε) δωρήματα. ἔχει δὲ οὐ-
 τως· [ὄ] βασιλεὺς Μενε-
 χέρης τριῶν θεῶν κη-
 225 δε[ί]αν [εὐ]σεβήσας αἰωνίαν

Col. xi.

εἴληφε δόξαν, [καὶ διὰ τῆς ?
 βίβλου τὴν φ[ήμην] εὐτυ-?
 * χήσας. τὴν τ[ο]ῦ Ἀσκλη-
 πίου παιδὸς Ἡφ[αίστου] τα-
 230 φῆν καὶ τὴν τ[ο]ῦ Ὠ[ρ]ου Ἐρ[-
 μ[ο]ῦ ἔτι δὲ Καλεοίβιος

τε Αἴγυπτος διὰ τοῦτο κ[α]ὶ
 καρποῖς ἀφ(θ)όνοις εὐθη-
 νεῖτο. τῇ γὰρ τοῦ προεσ-
 240 τῶτος εὐσεβεία ὑποτε-
 ταγμένοι εὐ[πο]ροῦσι χῶ-
 [ρ]αί, καὶ τοῦνα[ντί]ον ἐφ' οἷς

Ἀπόλλωνος παιδὸς ἀφθό-
 νο[ι]ς χρήμασιν δωρησά-
 μενος ἀντάποιναν ἕσ-
 235 χεν εὐδαιμονίας πλή-
 θος. ἀπολέμητος γὰρ τό-

ἐκεῖνος δυσσ[εβε]ῖ ἐπὶ
 τούτοις κακοῖς [ἀ]ναλίσκον-
 245 ται. ὃν δὲ τρόπον ἔχρη-
 σεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς Ἀσκληπίος
 σπουδάζειν αὐτ[ο]ῦ περὶ

‘Nectenibis on hearing this, being extremely vexed with the deserters from the temple and wishing to ascertain their number speedily by a list, ordered Nechautis, who then performed the duties of archidicastes, to investigate the book within a month, if possible. Nechautis conducted his researches with much strenuousness, and brought the list to the king after spending only two days instead of thirty upon the inquiry. On reading the book the king was quite amazed at the divine power in the story, and finding that there were twenty-six priests who conducted the god from Heliopolis to Memphis, he assigned to each of their descendants the due post of prophet. Not content with this, after completing the renewal of the book (?), he enriched Asclepius himself with three hundred and thirty arurae more of corn-land, especially because he had heard through the book that the god had been worshipped with marks of great reverence by Mencheres.

Having often begun the translation of the said book in the Greek tongue, I learnt at length how to proclaim it, but while I was in the full tide of composition my ardour was restrained by the greatness of the story, because I was about to make it public; for to gods alone, not to mortals, is it permitted to describe the mighty deeds of the gods. For if I failed, not only was I ashamed before men, but also hindered by the reproaches (?) that I should incur if the god were vexed, and by the poverty of my description, in course of completion, of his undying virtue (?). But if I did the god a service, both my life would be happy and my fame undying; for the god is disposed to confer benefits, since even those whose pious ardour is only for the moment are repeatedly preserved by him after the healing art has failed against diseases which have overtaken them. Therefore avoiding rashness I was waiting for the favourable occasion afforded by old age, and putting off the fulfilment of my promise; for then especially is youth wont to aim too high, since immaturity and enterprise too quickly extend our zeal. But when a period of three years had elapsed, in which I was no longer working, and for three years my mother was distracted by an ungodly quartan ague which had seized her, at length having with difficulty comprehended we came as suppliants before the god, entreating him to grant my mother recovery from the disease. He, having shown himself favourable, as he is to all, in dreams, cured her by simple remedies; and we rendered due thanks to our preserver by sacrifices. When I too afterwards was suddenly seized with a pain in my right side, I quickly hastened to the helper of the human race, and he, being again disposed to pity, listened to me, and displayed still more effectively his peculiar clemency, which, as I am intending to recount his terrible powers, I will substantiate.

It was night, when every living creature was asleep except those in pain, but divinity showed itself the more effectively; a violent fever burned me, and I was convulsed with loss of breath and coughing, owing to the pain proceeding from my side. Heavy in the head with my troubles I was lapsing half-conscious into sleep, and my mother, as a mother would for her child (and she is by nature affectionate), being extremely grieved at my agonies was sitting without enjoying even a short period of slumber, when suddenly she perceived—it was no dream or sleep, for her eyes were open immovably, though not seeing clearly, for a divine and terrifying vision came to her, easily preventing her from observing the god himself

or his servants, whichever it was. In any case there was some one whose height was more than human, clothed in shining raiment and carrying in his left hand a book, who after merely regarding me two or three times from head to foot disappeared. When she had recovered herself, she tried, still trembling, to wake me, and finding that the fever had left me and that much sweat was pouring off me, did reverence to the manifestation of the god, and then wiped me and made me more collected. When I spoke with her, she wished to declare the virtue of the god, but I anticipating her told her all myself; for everything that she saw in the vision appeared to me in dreams. After these pains in my side had ceased and the god had given me yet another assuaging cure, I proclaimed his benefits. But when we had again besought his favours by sacrifices to the best of our ability, he demanded through the priest who serves him in the ceremonies the fulfilment of the promise long ago announced to him, and we, although knowing ourselves to be debtors in neither sacrifices nor votive offering, nevertheless supplicated him again with them. But when he said repeatedly that he cared not for these but for what had been previously promised, I was at a loss, and with difficulty, since I disparaged it, felt the divine obligation of the composition. But since thou hadst once noticed, master, that I was neglecting the divine book, invoking thy providence and filled with thy divinity I hastened to the inspired task of the history. And I hope to extend by my proclamation the fame of thy inventiveness; for I unfolded truly by a physical treatise in another book the convincing account of the creation of the world. Throughout the composition I have filled up defects and struck out superfluities, and in telling a rather long tale I have spoken briefly and narrated once for all a complicated story. Hence, master, I conjecture that the book has been completed in accordance with thy favour, not with my aim; for such a record in writing suits thy divinity. And as the discoverer of this art, Asclepius, greatest of gods and my teacher, thou art distinguished by the thanks of all men. For every gift of a votive offering or sacrifice lasts only for the immediate moment, and presently perishes, while a written record is an undying meed of gratitude, from time to time renewing its youth in the memory. Every Greek tongue will tell thy story, and every Greek man will worship the son of Ptah, Imouthes. Assemble hither, ye kindly and good men; avaunt ye malignant and impious! Assemble, all ye . . ., who by serving the god have been cured of diseases, ye who practise the healing art, ye who will labour as zealous followers of virtue, ye who have been blessed by great abundance of benefits, ye who have been saved from the dangers of the sea! For every place has been penetrated by the saving power of the god.

I now purpose to recount his miraculous manifestations, the greatness of his power, the gifts of his benefits. The history is this. King Mencheres by displaying his piety in the obsequies of three gods, and being successful in winning fame through the book, has won eternal glory. He presented to the tombs of Asclepius son of Hephaestus, Horus son of Hermes, and also Caleoibis son of Apollo money in abundance, and received as recompense his fill of prosperity. For Egypt was then free from war for this reason, and flourished with abundant crops, since subject countries prosper by the piety of their ruler, and on the other hand owing to his impiety they are consumed by evils. The manner in which the god Asclepius bade Mencheres busy himself with his tomb . . .'

1. τα[ὐτ]α: the supposed τ has an unusually short cross-bar on the left, and perhaps πο[λλ]ά should be read. The preceding word might be [. . .]ι. From the references to τοῦ ἱεροῦ (l. 4), τῆς βίβλου (l. 9), and τὸν θεό[ν] (l. 20), as if they had been mentioned previously, it is clear that Col. i is not the actual beginning of the papyrus, which on the recto breaks off in the middle of a column at this point.

Νε[κτενε]ῖβις: for the form cf. Νεκτενίβις in Theopomp. Fr. 101 (G-H); Νεκτανεβώ, -τεναβώ, -τανέβις, &c., are found elsewhere.

4. τοῦ ἱεροῦ: sc. the Ἀσκληπιεῖον at Memphis (cf. ll. 21, 26, and introd.) rather than at Heliopolis (l. 19), where no temple of Asclepius is known.

7. Neither Νεχαῦτις (or -αῦτης) nor Νεχαῦς seems to be known, but Νεχαώθ occurs, and Νεχαώς and Νεχευώ as variants of Νεχαώ. διέποντι τότε τὴν ἀρχιδ[ι]κ[ασ]τε[ί]αν on the analogy of 727. 5 would imply that Nechautis or Nechaus was a deputy; but it is doubtful whether the word is used here in its technical sense, or as equivalent to διεξάγοντι in Ptolemaic documents, which does not imply that the person in question was a deputy; cf. P. Tebt. i, p. 84. The reference to an archidicastes in Pharaonic times is interesting. That official is known to have existed under the Ptolemies as well as under the Romans, and he may well have been the counterpart of a Pharaonic official. Mr. A. H. Gardiner compares the 'chief lector' Hardedef, who found writings in a temple (Erman, *Die Märchen d. Pap. Westcar*, i. 18; cf. p. 221). The superintendence of documents of various kinds was part of the duties of the archidicastes in Roman times; cf. e. g. 34.

9. μη(νί): cf. l. 13 ἀντι τριάκοντα ἡμερῶν. Of the second letter only the tip of a flourish similar to that of the final η of l. 11 is preserved.

24-5. These two lines are obscure and probably corrupt. ἀναγ[νώ]σεως (cf. l. 15) cannot be read. If ἀναν[εώ]σεως is right (ἀναν[εῦ]σεως seems to be the only alternative), the 'book of renewal' would have to be explained as a title derived from ancient Egyptian; but this comes in very abruptly and]οιησας suggests nothing but π]οιήσας or a compound, and we are disposed to think τὴν βίβλον ἀνανεώσεως a mistake for τῆς βίβλου ἀνανέωσιν (cf. the wrong cases in ll. 129-30), and to suppose a blank space, as often in 1381, before π]οιήσας, though [ἐκπ]οιήσας is possible. The last letter of αὐτόν is reduced to a mere speck of ink, and αὐτός can equally be read, but not αὐτὸ τ[ό], though Ἀσκληπιον might easily be a mistake for Ἀσκληπιεῖον: αὐτὸ (τό) is also unsatisfactory.

30. Μενχορέους: the ε above the line is apparently in the 1st hand and may represent an alternative spelling rather than a correction. -ηους is in late Ptolemaic times a common form of the genitive of names ending in -ης. In l. 223 the nominative is spelled Μενεχέρης, in Africanus *ap.* Syncellus Μενχέρης.

36. ρεύων: this form of the present corresponding to the future ρεύσω does not seem to be attested elsewhere.

45-9. Near the ends of ll. 48-67, and probably in ll. 45-7 also, a vertical strip of papyrus had scaled off the surface of the verso before it was written upon. Usually the scribe on reaching the single thickness, which had room for about two letters, left it blank, but in some cases he wrote across part or all of it, e. g. in ll. 48 and 56. This single layer has for the most part perished, but without affecting the reconstruction except in l. 57, where if a blank space was left τὸ must be omitted, and in ll. 45-8, where the ends of lines are missing and the size of the lacunae ranges from 5-7 letters according to the amount of notice taken of the presumably missing strip. The general sense of ll. 45-9 is that the writer was afraid of vexing the god by the inadequacy of his tribute to him, but the construction is not clear. The supposed λν of ἐκώλυσε is rather cramped, but ἐκώλυε cannot be read, and for the aorist cf. l. 37 ἐπεσχέθην. For τ]ὰ κατιόντα it is possible to substitute]ἀχανο[ύς . . ., but that is not a suitable epithet for Asclepius, and δια seems to be the plural of a neuter word meaning 'reproaches', perhaps a misspelling of ὄν(ε)ίδη; cf. Hdt. vii. 160 ὄνειδεα κατιόντα ἀνθρώπων. For ἀθα]γάτον cf. ll. 51 and 196, and for γρ]αφή[s] ll. 159, 175, 187, and 195. [καί in l. 46 makes the order of the following words rather awkward, and in ll. 47-8 τ]ῆς γρ]αφή[s] . . . συμπληρουμέν[ο]ί[s] . . . (but not -μένη[s] . . .) could be read, if a blank space was left (see above). For τ]απεινώμα cf. l. 158 ταπεινούντι μοι τοῦτο. ταπεινώσις is coupled with σμικρολογία τῆς λέξεως by Plut. *Mor.* p. 7 a. τ]ῆς γρ]αφῆς συμπληρουμέν[ης] may be genitive absolute, and ἀρετῆς would then be dependent on the word ending in -νώμα, which would perhaps be an easier construction.

49. For the spelling *οφελησαντι* cf. l. 72, where *ωμενοι* apparently represents <δε>όμενοι.

53. *αὐτ(ί)κα μόνον*: cf. l. 193 *τὸν παραυτ[ί]κα μ[ό]ν[ο]ν . . . κα[ι]ρ[ό]ν*. The only alternative seems to be *αὐτῶ μόνον*, which yields a less satisfactory sense, and the traces suit *a* much better than *ω*.

59. <γ>ήρ[ο]υς is not a known form and the *ηρ* is not quite certain, for *λε* might be read for *η* and *ι* or *φ* for *ρ*; but the omission of *γ* between vowels is easily explained and *γήρως* suits the context; cf. l. 63 *νε[ό]τ[η]ς*. Possibly the omissions in this line (a connecting particle is wanted; cf. ll. 97-8 and 222, notes) go still further, e. g. *τὸν τοῦ <γήρως καὶ . . . πλ>ήρ[ο]υς ἀνε[β]αλλό[μ]ην τὴν ὑπόσχεσιν*.

67-8. Nothing is wanted between *δ[έ]* and *τῆ*, and there was probably a blank space or a deletion. *ἄθεος* is a curious epithet to apply to *φρίκη*, but *δ[έ] θεός* spoils the construction by becoming the subject of *ἐστρόβει* and so producing two nominatives. If *τεταρταία η φρίκη* is corrected to *τεταρταίη (or -α) φρέικη*, which was certainly not written, *τριετής . . . ἐπισκ[ή]ψας* agreeing with *δ[έ] θεός* is very unsatisfactory, for both words ought to agree with *φρέικη*, so that further emendation becomes necessary, and the confusion of the construction would be far worse than in ll. 158-60. If *θεός* is not *ἄθεος*, [*ἀ(πὸ)*] *θεο(ῦ)* is the simplest change; but a reference to the god is not wanted in l. 68, especially as he is mentioned in l. 71. *ἐπισυ[]* could be read in place of *ἐπισκ[]*, but suggests no suitable verb, whereas *ἐπισκήπτειν* is often used of *νόσοι*.

72. *ωμενοι* apparently represents *δεόμενοι* rather than *εὐχόμενοι*: for *ο* in place of *ω* cf. l. 49 *οφελησαντι*. That *δέ* occurred in the lacuna at the end of the preceding line is unlikely, for *ι* is written rather large and may well be the last letter, and final *ε* generally has a long flourish, which should be visible.

74. *δι' ὀνειράτων*: cf. Aristides' diary in his *ἱεροὶ λόγοι*.

89-91. Cf. ll. 218-22.

97-8. *ἄσθματί τε καὶ βηκί*: *τε* is perhaps a mistake for *δέ*; cf. l. 59, note. *βηκί* for *βηχί* is probably not a mere misspelling, *βήκιον* and *βηκία* being attested.

99. For *σφαδαῖζειν* in place of the usual *σφαδάζειν* see Herodian, *Περὶ μου*, *λεξ.* 23. The passive of *καρηβαρεῖν* is very rare.

100. {*ἀ*} *λήθαργος*: *ἀληθάργητος* in the sense of 'active' is known (Hesych. *ἀλήστων ἀληθαργήτων*), but *ἀλήθαργος*, in which the *a*- owing to the context cannot have a privative force, is unattested and seems to be an error for *λήθαργος*.

108. *ἑώρα* has no object, the writer altering the construction; cf. ll. 136 and 158-60.

111. *μέν* has no corresponding *δέ*, but is answered by *πλὴν ἦν κτλ.* in l. 117; cf. the preceding note.

136. *πρ[ο]ε]λομένη*: the dative can be connected with *αὐτῆ* in l. 138, but the sentence is somewhat involved, and *πρ[ο]ε]λομένη(ς)* would be an improvement, or possibly *πρ[ο]ε]λομένη* was a nominative absolute; cf. ll. 108 and 158-60, notes. The traces of the first two letters are very slight, but exclude *βο[ν]λομένη*.

138. *ἀπήγγελον* is perhaps a new form of the aorist rather than a misspelling of *ἀπήγγελλ(λ)ον*.

148. [τ]οῦ: or [τ]ου = *τινός*.

156-8. *διηπορ[ο]ῦ[με]ν* could be read for *διηπόρ[ο]ν[κα]ί*, but the correction of *εἶπεν* to *εἶπεν* seems necessary.

158-60. *ταπεινοῦντί μοι* is inconsistent with *ὑπήει με*: cf. ll. 108 and 136, notes. *τοῦτο* can refer to *τῶ προκαθωμολ[ο]γημένῳ* or to *τὸ θεῖον τῆς γραφῆς χρέος*, which follows.

164. There is not room for [έκ] *πληρωθείς*, and probably the space after the corrected *καί* (cf. critical note) was blank.

168-74. For *κατα[πλ]ώσειν*, i. e. *καθα[πλ]ώσειν*, cf. l. 173 *ἀνήπλωσα*. It is not certain that more than one letter is lost, but *κατα[δ]ώσειν* yields no sense. *καθαπλοῦν* is much rarer than

ἀναπλοῦν, for which cf. Hermes Trismeg. *Poemānd.* i. 16 οὐπω γάρ σοι ἀνήπλωσα τὸν πρῶτον λόγον. The force of *κατα* in *καθαπλοῦν* here seems to be 'widely' unfold (cf. ll. 198–202), as contrasted with the beginning of the process (ἀναπλοῦν). *κατα*[πλ]ώσειν would be correct as the Ionic form of *καταπλεύσειν*, but there is no parallel for the metaphorical use of this verb in the sense of 'come to an end', and the alteration of ἀνήπλωσα to ἀνέπλωσα in l. 173 would leave μῦθον to be governed by *προφητεύων* supplied from l. 169 or by some omitted participle, which is very unsatisfactory.

180. ἀλλαττόλογος is a new compound. For μῦθον cf. l. 172.

181. For [δέσ]ποτα cf. l. 162 with σήν in the next line, as here. The *ο* is very uncertain and]ντε or]ντα could be read.

187. τ[αὐτ]ης: sc. γραφῆς. The invention of demotic writing is usually credited to Thoth and Isis (cf. p. 193), but cf. p. 224.

197. ἀνηβάσκ[ο]υσα τῆ[ν] μνήμην: ἀνηβάσκειν is a very rare equivalent of ἀνηβάν, and is censured by Thomas Magister. The accusative (of respect?) after it is curious, and possibly our author treated it as a transitive verb.

201. φθᾶ: cf. Rosetta Inscr. 4. The Greek equivalent Ἡφ[αίστου] is used in l. 229; cf. p. 222.

211. πονήσετε ζηλ[ωτα]ί: ποιήσετε (or possibly -σεσθε) or παρήσετε could be read, but not ζῆν. Since ζηλ[ωτα]ί ἀρετῆς is fairly certain (cf. Isocr. *Demon.* p. 4 b), an intransitive verb is required.

222. (τε) δωρήματα: for the omission of a connecting particle cf. ll. 59, 97, and 226–8, notes. δ is fairly certain, but the next two letters are very doubtful and the termination might be ημων.

223. [δ]: it is not certain that any letter is lost.

226–8. For διὰ τῆς] βίβλου cf. l. 29. The punctuation is uncertain. If τῆν φ[ήμην εὐτυ]χῆσας (cf. l. 50) is right, that participle is to be connected with what precedes rather than with what follows, and is an explanation of αἰωνίαν εἴληφε δόξαν (cf. ll. 195–8), but there is an asyndeton in l. 228. With ὁς διὰ τῆς] there still seems to be no connecting particle between]χῆσας and δωρησάμενος in l. 233, and l. 227 must be restored differently. The βίβλος is presumably the ancient Egyptian roll, as usual, but it appears here to be directly connected with Menkaura, not merely mentioned as evidence for his action ([ὁς ἐκ τῆς] βίβλου is unsatisfactory); possibly he wrote it nominally himself; cf. p. 223.

228–32. Cf. pp. 223–4. In l. 229 Ἡφ[αίστου] the vestiges suit η very well and are consistent with φ. In l. 230 τ[. . .]ρου (or]ιου or]του) might be read, but the article, though omitted in l. 231, is confirmed by l. 228, and τ[οῦ] Ω]ρου is much the most probable restoration. The ρ is written through what seems to be a blot of ink due to a correction, but there is no reason to think that the ρ was deleted.

234. ἀντάποιναν: the form seems to be unattested, but ἀντίποινα (neut. plur.) in the MSS. of the tragic poets is often misspelled ἀντάποινα.

247. περὶ] [τῆς ταφῆς (cf. l. 229) is probable.

1382. TALE OF SARAPIS AND SYRION.

15 × 25.3 cm.

Second century.

The recto of this papyrus contains portions of an official account of taxation on land, written in the second century and mentioning the 18th year of an emperor (Hadrian or Antoninus?), and will be published in Part XII. On the

verso, in a large uncultivated cursive hand of the same century, is the conclusion and title of a story concerning the ἀρετή of Zeus-Helios-Sarapis (cf. 1149. 1, note) in connexion with a pilot called Syrion. The papyrus had been reduced to about half its height before the verso was used, but was doubtless a long roll originally, and many columns may have been lost before Col. i, of which only the ends of lines survive. The tale ends with Syrion's disposal of some water, which probably had healing or otherwise miraculous qualities, to the inhabitants of Pharos. The story, which seems to have been based upon a manuscript preserved at Alexandria (l. 19, note), appears to have been Greek rather than Egyptian in origin, and is perhaps to be classed with the compositions of persons who had been cured of diseases at the Serapeum of Canopus, mentioned by Strabo (cf. p. 225). On Hellenistic 'aretology' in general see Reitzenstein, *Hellenistische Wundererzählungen*, 10 sqq., and cf. 1381.

Col. ii.

]ναπη	15	εἶπεν· διὰ σὲ χάρισται τὸ ὕδωρ Φαρίταις.
]ε . ι σὺ ὁ		καὶ ἀσπάσαμενος αὐτὸν ἀνέπλευσεν,
]να ε		καὶ ἀ(πο)δίδωσι τὸ ὕδωρ Φαρίταις καὶ λαμβάνει
]τα γυ-		παρ' αὐτῶν εἰς τιμὴν ἀργυρίου) (δραχμὰς) ρ. καὶ
5]ν βίον		καταχωρίζεται ἡ ἀρετὴ ἐν ταῖς Μερκουρίου
]νοϛ	20	βιβλιοθήκαις. οἱ παρόντες εἶπατε εἰς Ζεὺς
]αφον		Σάραπισ. [[.]]
μ]ενοϛ		Διὸς Ἡλίου μεγάλου Σαρά- πιδος ἀρετὴ ἢ περὶ Συ- ρίωνα τὸν κυβερνή- την.
] . . ε		
10]ω		
]νη	25	
]εν		
]ν		
] . ι .		

1. π above τ deleted. 16. και corr. from δια. 17. ὕδωρ Pap. 22. υσαρα written over some expunged letters. 24. υ of κυβερνητην corr. from ε.

' . . . he said "For your sake I will bestow the water upon the people of Pharos." And having saluted him he sailed forth, and gave the water to the people of Pharos, receiving from them as its value 100 drachmae of silver. This act of grace is registered in the libraries of Mercurium. Let all present say "There is one Zeus Sarapis." (Title) The act of grace of Zeus-Helios, great Sarapis, regarding Syrion the pilot.'

17. ἀ(πο)δίδωσι or {α}δίδωσι can be read.

19. ταῖς Μερκουρίου βιβλιοθήκαις : cf. 886. 2-5 ἀντίγραφον ἱερᾶς βίβλου τῆς εὐρετίσης ἐν τοῖς τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ ταμίαις, which is the heading of a magical formula for obtaining an omen, and another heading of a magical formula in *Catal. codd. Astr. Graec.* vii, p. 62 βίβλος εὐρεθείσα ἐν Ἡλιουπόλει τῆς Αἰγύπτου ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἐν ἀδύτοις ἐγγεγραμμένη ἐν ἱεροῖς γράμμασι. Μερκουρίου may be merely equivalent to Ἑρμοῦ, but since the story is concerned with Pharos the Mercury quarter of Alexandria (Hirschfeld, *Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten*, 364-5) is likely to be meant. Whether it was called Μερκούριος or Μερκούριον is doubtful, the nominative not being found, but the neuter form is the more probable.

20. εἰς Ζεὺς Σάραπις is a common formula on gems; cf. 1380. 6, note.

1383. SAILOR'S SONG.

5.4 × 12 cm.

Late third century.

This interesting little poem, a prayer to the Rhodian winds for a calm voyage, apparently complete, is closely parallel to 425, a brief invitation to sailors to compare the sea and the Nile, written in the second or third century in the metre $\underline{\cup\cup} - \underline{\cup\cup} - | \cup\cup\cup$, and to P. Amh. 2, an early fourth-century acrostic Christian hymn in practically the same metre; cf. Wilamowitz, *Gött. gel. Anz.* 1904. 670, P. Maas, *Philol.* 1909. 445-6, Powell, *Class. Quarterly*, v. 177. The 10 στίχοι are sometimes marked off by strokes, like the double dots indicating the στίχοι in the alphabetically arranged P. Amh. 2, but as in 425 the writing is continuous. The script is third-century cursive, probably dating from about 250-280; it is thus somewhat later than 425, as is also indicated by the greater irregularity of the metre. In 425 the metrical value of syllables still depends on quantity, not accent, except in one instance where Νείλου is scanned as a trochee, whereas in 1383, as in P. Amh. 2, accent is often more important than quantity, e. g. v. 4 ὅτε μένειν, v. 7 ἄλ' ὑποτάξατε ναῦσιβάταις. Dactyls occur in place of anapaests or spondees in the first part of the verse more often than in P. Amh. 2, and the rule observed carefully in 425, and almost without exception in P. Amh. 2, that a verse should end with a paroxytone iambus, which results in the form ὑδάτη being employed in 425 for ὕδατα, is violated in e. g. v. 3 ἐγώ, v. 8 ἐπίγεται. Verses 6 and 10 are highly irregular and probably corrupt.

In the right-hand margin is the title; on the left hand are the ends of two lines which are likely to have belonged to another poem of the same character, though not certainly in the same hand. There is a margin above and below Col. ii which seems to be, like 425, complete, though a word is wanted at the end, and the poem may possibly have been continued in another column; cf. l. 10, note.

Col. i.

Col. ii.

] . Ῥοδίους ἐκέλευον ἀνέμοις / ² καὶ μέρεσι σοῖς πελαγίοις,
] ³ ὅτε πλέειν ἤθελον ἐγώ. / ⁴ ὅτε μένειν ἤθελον
] ἐκεῖ, ⁵ ἔλεγον μέρε(σιν) πελαγίο[ι]ς ⁶ μὴ <υυ> τυπῆ τὰ
] πελάγη. / ⁷ ἄλ'
 5]ογ[[αρ]] ὑποτάξατε ναυσιβά[τ]αις. ⁸ ὄλος ἄρ' ἀνεμος ἐπίγεται. ⁹ ἀπέ-
 10 κλειε τὰ πνεύματα καί, ν[ύ]ξ, ¹⁰ δὸς τὰ [ύδ]ατα ἐύβατα.
 In the right-hand margin at right angles
 'Ῥοδίους ἀνέ[μοις].'

6. 1. τοῖς for σοῖς. 9. ὑποταξατε Pap. s of ναυσιβα[τ]αις above the line. ν of ανεμος corr.(?).
 1. ἀπόκλειε.

'I commanded the Rhodian winds and the seaward parts when I wished to sail; when I wished to remain there, I said to the seaward parts that the sea should not be smitten. Make the ocean obedient to seafarers! Suddenly a whole tempest arises. Shut off the winds, and, night, grant that the waters be smooth. (Title) To the Rhodian winds.'

6. μέρεσι, unless corrected to μέρεσι(ν), is scanned as a dactyl; cf. introd. In v. 5 the word is abbreviated, and the same difficulty arises, but though two dactyls occur in place of two anapaests in vv. 7, 8, ἔλεγον in v. 5 is in favour of μέρε(σιν) there.

σοῖς: the top of the first letter is lost, but the bottom of the surviving stroke turns to the right, whereas the bottom of a τ should be straight or turn to the left. The second person singular is found in l. 10, where νύξ is addressed, but is out of place with μέρεσι πελαγίοις, which recurs in l. 8 without σοῖς, and τοῖς was no doubt meant.

7. ὅτε πλέειν: the form πλέειν is often found in MSS., but is usually corrected to πλείν. Here it corresponds metrically to μένειν in the next verse, the first syllable being apparently lengthened in both words owing to the accent, unless the first syllable of ὅτε is lengthened; cf. introd. To read πλε(ί)ειν is unnecessary.

8. ἐκεῖ seems to mean Rhodes. For μέρε(σιν) cf. l. 6, note. An adjective making a tribrach or trochee seems to have been omitted after μὴ; cf. l. 10, note. For τυπῆ cf. Hom. δ 580 ἄλα τύπτον ἔρετροῖς. Possibly, however, μὴ <υυ> τύπτ[ε(τε)] or μὴ τύπτ[ε(τε -)] should be restored before τὰ πελάγη.

9. ναυσιβάτης for ναυβάτης occurs in Manetho i. 123. For the shortened first syllable cf. the next note and introd.

10. καί is treated as short; cf. introd. Verse 10 will not scan unless δὸς θ' [ύδ]ατ' ἐύβατα <υ- > be read. There is not room for [κυμ]ατα, and after ευβατα any further letters would run into the μ of ανε[μοις] belonging to the title, of which the termination may have been obliterated, although the papyrus is preserved. Perhaps, however, ἀνέ(μοις) should be read there; the traces of the ε are very slight and the letter may be raised above the line. This would leave room for 3 or 4 letters between ευβατα and the edge of the papyrus. The missing syllables may have come in the next column, if Col. ii was one of a series; cf. introd. But δὸς, the manner of writing the title, and the general appearance of the papyrus all suggest the conclusion of the poem, and an omission is likely enough; cf. l. 8, note.

1384. MEDICAL RECIPES, THEOLOGICAL EXTRACTS.

30.2 × 15.4 cm.

Fifth century.

The beginning and end of this remarkable papyrus consist of medical recipes, the first for a purge, the others for curing strangury and wounds, while the middle portion is taken up with two theological extracts, which have evidently been inserted on account of their medical interest, perhaps as a kind of charm. The rather large, irregular semiuncial hand and numerous mistakes of spelling indicate an uncultivated writer of, probably, the fifth rather than the sixth century. A few corrections are all by the scribe himself, who employed the brown ink common at this period. The lower part of the papyrus is practically complete, but in the upper part nearly all the right-hand half is missing, entailing the loss of only some of the figures in the first recipe, but the ends of all the lines except one in the first extract, of which the reconstruction presents difficulties, although the general sense is clear.

Lines 15-22 are apparently derived from an uncanonical gospel. Jesus meets some persons, who ask Him how the sick can be relieved. The answer is that He has provided olive-oil and myrrh for those who believe in the name (or power) 'of the Father, the Holy Spirit, and the Son', a notable inversion of the usual order of the Second and Third Persons of the Trinity. The scene is laid ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, and possibly the background was suggested by Matt. viii. 2-4, Mark i. 40-5, Luke v. 12-16, where the healing of a leper is stated by Mark and Luke to have led directly to the departure of Jesus ἐπ' ἐρήμοις τόποις or ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις; or if the persons who met Jesus were lepers (cf. ll. 15 and 17, notes) there might be a connexion with Luke xvii. 11-14; or, as Dr. J. V. Bartlet proposes (cf. l. 15, note), the background may have been provided by Matt. xiv. 13-14, which has ἐρήμων τόπων and ἐθεράπευσε (cf. θαραπία in l. 17). If ἡμ[ί]ν in l. 15 is rightly restored, the gospel to which the extract belongs must have been professedly written by one of the disciples. The first person singular or plural occurred in the narrative of (1) the Gospel of Peter, (2) the Gospel of the Ebionites, which is probably identical with that of the Twelve Apostles (Harnack, *Gesch. d. altchr. Liter.* i. 625 sqq.), (3) the Gospel of Philip, (4) 1224, if με in Fr. 2 recto. ii. 1 belongs to the narrative, and possibly also in (5) the Gospel of Thomas, (6) the Traditions of Matthias, and (7) the Fayûm Gospel-fragment, of which three the extant remains are too slight to show the character of the narrative; but in 655, 840, and 1081 the disciples are referred to in the third person, as presumably in the Gospels according to the Hebrews and Egyptians.

The second extract (ll. 23-9) is quite different from the first, being concerned with the 'angels of the Lord' who are represented as having gone up to heaven

to seek a remedy for their eyes from Jehovah Sabaoth, to whose power they appeal. The story seems to be incomplete, and this suggests that the first extract too perhaps broke off prematurely, though it ends at a more intelligible point than the second. The link connecting the excerpts with the medical prescriptions is probably not so much the mention of the olive-oil and myrrh as relieving sickness, and the sponge as relieving the eyes, but in the implied virtue of an appeal by name in the one case to the Trinity, in the other to Jehovah Sabaoth, who is often invoked in Gnostic prayers, e. g. 1060. The second extract is clearly not taken from any gospel like that of Peter and (apparently) that of the Twelve Apostles, which covered the same ground as the Synoptists, but the Gospel of Philip, of which the only extant fragment begins ἀπεκάλυψέ μοι ὁ κύριος τί τὴν ψυχὴν δεῖ λέγειν ἐν τῷ ἀνιέναι εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν (cf. ll. 23-4) καὶ πῶς ἐκάστη τῶν ἄνω δυνάμεων ἀποκρίνεσθαι, was a document of a different class, and seems a possible source for both excerpts. It is, however, safer to regard them as independent of each other, and in that case the second extract may well be from a Jewish, rather than Christian, work of an apocalyptic character similar to e. g. the *Apocalypse of Baruch* (cf. 403) or the *Ascension of Isaiah* (P. Amh. 1).

The first excerpt, considered by itself, can hardly be assigned with any confidence to a particular gospel, especially as it is uncertain what term was used in the narrative in speaking of Jesus (cf. l. 16, note). The unorthodox order of the Persons of the Trinity seems to point in the direction of that early conception which found expression in a curious fragment of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, ἄρτι ἔλαβέ με ἡ μήτηρ μου τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐν μιᾷ τῶν τριχῶν μου καὶ ἀπήνεγκέ με εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ μέγα Θαβώρ, and since that gospel is not itself a suitable source for ll. 15-22, there is something to be said in favour of assigning the passage to the Jewish-Christian Gospel of the Twelve Apostles, which Epiphanius and Jerome for obscure reasons wrongly identified with the Gospel according to the Hebrews. The Ebionite Gospel was probably a century later than the other, and unlike it was a secondary document of a pronounced Gnostic character, while the Gospel of Peter, which is partly based on the canonical Gospels but was used by Justin along with them, occupies a middle position, Harnack assigning its composition to A. D. 110-30. The Akhmîm fragment shows that the Gospel of Peter, to which 1224 possibly belongs, was still being studied in Upper Egypt in the fifth century, but the Gospel of the Twelve Apostles, as a Jewish-Christian work, is perhaps more likely to have been associated with the source of the second extract.

Φούσκας καθαρσίου·

Ⲡ κυμίνου (δραχμαὶ) δ,

	μαράθου (δρ.)	β,		¶ ἄγγελοι κ(υρίο)υ ἀνήρθαν πρὸς μ[έσον]
	σελίνου (δρ.)	δ,		τὸν οὐρανὸν ὀφθαλμοὺς
5	κόστου (δρ.)	δ,	25	πονο(ῦ)ντες καὶ σφόγγον κρα-
	μαστίχης (δρ.)	δ,		τοῦντες. λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ κ(υρίο)υ, τί ἀνήρ-
	κωρίου (δρ.)	ζ,		θατε, ἀγνοὶ πανκάθαροι; ἴασιν λαβῖν
	δαφνόκοκκα	κα,		ἀνήλθαμεν, Ἰαὼ Σαβαώθ, ὅτι σοὶ
	καροίου (δρ.)	[.		δοινατὸς καὶ οἰσχιρός.
10	πέρνης (δρ.)	[.	30	εἰς στραγγουριτία, ἰᾶσε τὸν πο-
	γλήχωνος (δρ.)	[.		νο(ῦ)ντα·
	φοίλλου (δρ.)	[.		¶ λαβὸν σπέρμα ἀγίνου ξερόν [
	ἄλατος	[τρίψας μετὰ {υ}οῖνου Ἀσκαλω[-
	ῥξους	[νίτου εἶτα θερμὰ πίν{ν}ε.
15	¶ ἀπήνησαν ἡμῖν ἀνδ]ρες			¶ εἰς θαραπίαν οὐλον·
	ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ κα[ὶ εἶπαν τῷ κ(υρί)ῳ,	35		λαβὸν μῆλα κυπαρίσ(σ)ου
	Ἰησοῦ, τί(ς) ἔνη θαραπία ἀρρώ[στοις;			ζέσας κλοῖζου.
	καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, ἔλεον ἀπέδ[ωκα ἐ-			
	λήας καὶ σβύρν[α]ν ἐξέχ[υσα τοῖς			
20	πεποιθόσι τ[ῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ			
	πατρὸς καὶ ἀγ[ί]ου [πν(εύματο)ς καὶ τοῦ			
	υἱοῦ. >>>>			

3. μ of μαραθου corr. 7. 1. κορίου. 9. 1. καρῖου. 12. First λ of φοίλλου above the line; 1. φύλλον. 17. ἰησου Π; 1. Ἰησοῦ . . . ἐνι θεραπεία. 18. 1. ἔλαιον . . . ἐ]λαίας. 19. 1. σμύρν[α]ν. 22. ὑίου Π. 23. 1. ἀνήλθαν. 25. σφογγόν Π. 1. σπόγγον. 26. τοῖς of αυτοῖς above the line. 1. κ(ύριος) . . . ἀνήλθατε. 27. ν of αγνοι corr. from οι, and ο from υ? ἴασιν Π. 28. Second α of ἀνηλθαμεν corr. from ω. ἴαω Π. 28-9. 1. σὺ δυνατὸς καὶ ἰσχυρός. οι of οισχιρος above the line. 30. 1. στραγγουρητιάν. ἴασε Π; 1. ἰᾶσαι. 31. 1. λαβῶν σπ. ἀκίνου. 32. ὑοῖνου Π. 34. 1. θαραπίαν οὐλῶν. 35. 1. λαβῶν. 36. λ of κλοῖζου above the line; 1. κλύζου.

‘Ingredients of a purging draught: cummin 4 drachmae, fennel 2 dr., parsley 4 dr., costus 4 dr., mastich 4 dr., coriander 7 dr., 21 laurel-berries, nut . dr., ham (?) . dr., pennyroyal . dr., silphium (?) . dr., salt . ., vinegar . .

. . . men met us in the desert and said to the Lord “Jesus, what cure is possible for the sick?” And He saith to them “I gave olive-oil and poured forth myrrh to them that believe in the name of the Father, the Holy Spirit, and the Son.”

The angels of the Lord went up to mid-heaven, suffering in their eyes and holding a sponge. The Lord saith to them “Why came ye up, ye holy and all-pure?” (They say) “We came up to receive a remedy, Jehovah Sabaoth, for thou art mighty and strong.”

For strangury, to heal the sufferer. Take the dry seed of basil-thyme, crumble it with wine of Ascalon, then drink it hot.

For treating wounds. Take the fruit of a cypress, boil it and apply.’

10. Whether in this context *πέρνα* has its ordinary meaning of 'ham' is doubtful; a herb would be expected.

12. *φύλλον* in medical writers is used sometimes with special reference to *μαλάβαθρον* (betel-nut), which was exported from India, and *σιλφιον*, which was exported from Cyrene. The latter is more likely to be meant.

15. The position assigned to the isolated fragment]*ρες* is not certain, but no other place seems at all suitable. *θε*, *θω*, *εω*, or *ου*, but not *ος*, may be read for *ες*, only the tops of the letters being preserved; but no combination with ll. 17-19 or 23 results, and in ll. 16 and 20-1 the restorations, which are fairly certain, are inconsistent with this fragment. Bartlet prefers *ἡμ[ὶν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι*, comparing 1224. Fr. 2 verso. ii. 1, but *ἄνδ]ρες* at this point seems satisfactory. The preceding word may well have been a number (e.g. *τρεις*), but since the exact length of the lacuna is uncertain there are several possibilities. *ἡμ[ὶν λεπροὶ ἄνδ]ρες* might also be read on the analogy of Luke xvii. 11 *δέκα λεπροὶ ἄνδρες* (cf. the other story of the healing of a leper mentioned in the introd.), but, as Bartlet observes, the context suggests that the questioners were persons who wanted to know how Jesus did his cures, rather than subjects of such cures.

16. *αὐτῷ* or *τῷ σ(ωτῆ)ρι* (cf. 840) may be restored instead of *τῷ κ(υρί)ῳ*, which is the term used in the Gospels of Peter and Philip, or *Ἰησοῦ* might be dative instead of vocative; cf. 1224.

17. For the spelling *θαραπία* cf. l. 34 and the Arsinoïte *ἄμφοδον θαραπείας* (e.g. P. Tebt. 329. 3). After this come very faint traces of the bottoms of four letters, of which the first seems to have begun rather high up and may well be *α*, while the third has a vertical stroke suggesting *γ*, *ι*, *ρ*, or *τ*. For *ἄρρώ[στοις]* (Bartlet) cf. Mark vi. 13 *ἤλειψον ἐλαίῳ πολλοὺς ἄρρώστους*, but if the second and third letters were *ρρ* there was a blank space between them. *ἡμῖν* [. . . is less satisfactory, but the sentence may have ended at *θαραπία* and the next word be a verb. *ἄπτε[ται]* (cf. e.g. Matt. viii. 3 *ἤψατο αὐτοῦ*) might be read, but hardly *ἤψα[το]*, and there would be room after it for *δέ*, but not *αὐτῶν*. This reading would require *λεπροὶ ἄνδ]ρες* in l. 15; cf. note *ad loc.*

18-19. The fourth letter of *απεδ]*, if not *δ*, can only be *λ*, but *δ* is more suitable. Neither *ἀπέδ[ωκα]* nor *ἀπέδ[(ε)ιξα]* makes a very good contrast with *ἐξέχ[υσα]*, of which only the tops of the letters survive, and one verb would be sufficient; but though *οξ* can quite well be read for *εξ* (*ο* is really preferable to *ε*), and *υ* is possible in place of *χ* (or *κ*), *ῥζου[σαν]* is inadmissible, not only on account of the third letter, which, if not *ε*, must be *ι*, but because after the fourth the top of a high letter like *σ* ought to have been visible. *ἐξεῦ[ρον]* and *ἐξέχ[εα]* are open to the same objection.

20-2. For *τ[ῷ ὀνόματι]* cf. Matt. xxviii. 19 *βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος*, and introd. *τ[ῆ] δυνάμει* (Bartlet) can be substituted.

23-4. *μ[έσον | τὸν οὐρανόν]*: the first letter, if not *μ*, can only be *λ*, *ν*, or *π*. After a lacuna of two letters comes what may be the bottom of a vertical stroke, or merely a stain or accidental spot. *π[έμ]π[τον]* is possible, but not *τ[ὸν] τ[ρί]τον*.

25. *σφόγγον* might be for *σπόγγων* (cf. l. 31 *λαβον*) and the plural would be an advantage, but *κρατεῖν* in the sense of 'holding in the hand', which occurs in Plutarch, Athenaeus, and other late writers, but not in the N. T., would be expected to govern the accusative.

27. *λέγουσιν* seems to have dropped out between *ἀγνοὶ πανκάθαροι* and *ἴασιν λαβῖν*, or else *οἱ δὲ εἶπαν* is omitted.

30. *στραγγουριτία* (i. e. *-ρητία*) is an unknown equivalent of *στραγγουρία*, and of doubtful validity.

31. *ξερόν* is an Ionic form, but more probably a misspelling of *ξηρόν*; cf. l. 17 *Ἰησοῦ*.

V. HOMER FRAGMENTS

(The collations are with the text of Ludwich.)

- 1385.** Fr. 2 7.3 × 5.7 cm. Two fragments, found with 1369-74, &c., of a leaf from a papyrus codex, containing on the recto the beginnings of B 444-6 and 456-67 (the writing on the verso being obliterated), with occasional breathings and accents. 460 η χηνφ[υ. Fifth century; in a sloping uncial hand; brown ink.
- 1386.** 19.9 × 7.8 cm. Found with 1365 and 1392. On the recto parts of 2 lines in cursive. On the verso the upper part of a column containing portions of Δ 257-71, with some accents and marks of elision and quantity. A low stop occurs in l. 262. 260 κρητηρσι κερῶν[ται 262 πινωσι. σου. Third century; in an upright informal hand.
- 1387.** 9.9 × 4.2 cm. Middle parts of E 206-24 with occasional high stops and accents (208 βαλών). Second century; in well-formed round upright uncials of medium size.
- 1388.** Fr. 1 7.6 × 8.6 cm. Four fragments, the first containing parts of Z 133-7 from the end of a column, and the others parts of Z 138-50 and 156-60 from the next column, of which l. 160 was the last line. Stops occur in the form of an acute accent high above the line, probably by a second hand. The papyrus has *οι* not *μιν* in l. 159. First century B. C. (found with a contract dated in the 19th year of Ptolemy Auletes, to be published in Part XII); in good-sized uncials of similar type to those of 659 and 686.
- 1389.** 6 × 17.7 cm. Fragment of a double leaf from a vellum codex containing on p. 1 beginnings of H 182-94, on p. 2 ends of 218-30, on p. 3 a few letters from the beginnings of 250-5, and on p. 4 a few letters from the ends of 285-9, with frequent accents, breathings, and marks of elision; stops in the middle position occur twice. Late fourth century; in a sloping uncial hand similar to that of the Freer Gospels; brown ink.
- 1390.** 6.2 × 5 cm. Fragment of leaf from a papyrus codex containing on the verso parts of I 287-96 and on the recto parts of 325-31, with frequent accents. 328 δῆ. Fifth century; in slightly sloping rather heavy uncials; brown ink.
- 1391.** Fr. 1 3.9 × 3.7 cm. Four fragments (one very small one unidentified), found with 1369-74, &c., from the middle of two leaves of a papyrus codex of Λ, written in brown ink in a large heavy sloping uncial of the fifth century.

The text, which varies considerably from the vulgate and seems to be remarkably corrupt, is:

Fr. 1.

Recto.	Verso.
526? [.]σι[566] θο[υριδος αλκης
527 [ε]υρυ γα[ρ αμφ ωμοισιν	567 ερητυ]σασκ[ε φαλαγγας
528 [κε]ισσ υμ . [568] τρωπα[σκετο φευγειν
	569 ε]πι νηα[ς οδευειν

Frs. 2 and 3.

Recto.

597 [Νεστορα δ εκ πολεμ]οιο φερ[ον Νηληϊαι ιπποι
598 [ιδρωσαι ηγον δε Μ]αχαενα π[οιμενα λαων
599 [τον δε ιδω]ν εν[οησε] ποδαρκης [διος Αχιλλευς
600 [εστηκει γα]ρ επι π[ρυ]μ[ν]η μεγ[ακτηι νηι
601 [εισορων π]ονον αιπ[νυ] ιω[κα τε δακρυοεσσαν
602 [αιψα δ εταιρ]ον εο[ν Πατροκληα προσειπε

Verso.

634 [τεσσαρ εσαν δοιαι δε πελειαδε]ς λ εκ[αστον
635 [χρυσειαι νεμεθοντο <δυω> δ υπο πυθμε]νεσς ησαν [
636 [αλλος μεν μογεων αποκιν]ησασκε τ[ραπ]εξ[ης
637? [πλειον εον Νεστωρ δ ο γερων α]ι[εογητις α[.]. φαν [
[25 letters] . ητ[. . .]εσκετο . [
640? [31 letters]σο λευκ[α ?
641? [πινεμεναι δ εκελευσεν επει ρ ωπλισσε] κϋκ[ειω

526. *Αἴας δὲ* MSS. 528. *κείσ' ἵππους* MSS. For the doubled σ cf. l. 635, but the second is very doubtful, being more like γ. 598. l. *Μαχαενα*. 634. *ἀμφίς* (or -φί) *ἕκαστον* MSS. 635. An omission of about 3 letters apparently occurred in the earlier part of this line. 637. *ἀμόγητι ἄειρεν* MSS. 638-40. The MSS. have *ἐν τῷ ῥά σφι κύκησε γυνή εἰκυῖα θεῆσιν οἶνον Πραμνείῳ, ἐπὶ δ' αἴγειον κνή τυρὸν κνήστι χαλκείῃ, ἐπὶ δ' ἄλφιτα λευκὰ πάλυνε*. Mr. T. W. Allen suggests that after ll. 636 or 637 some new lines were added referring to Hecamede and proposes *μέ]σολευ[κον εχουσα* or *-[κα φορουσα* with either *χιτωνα* or *ειματα*. *π[αρεκ]εσκετο* (cf. ξ' 521) does not seem possible in the previous line. The vestiges of the supposed l. 641 are very uncertain, but ll. 637 and 640 may have been meant, though very corrupt.

1392. 14.2 × 9.1 cm. Found with 1365 and 1386. On the recto first halves of O 303-25. 307 βιβων. 308 ωμοισιν. 311 τη. 324 κλονεουσι[[ν]]. Third

- century; in upright calligraphic uncials of biblical type, resembling 25, 661, 867, P. Rylands 16. On the verso, which is partly covered by strips gummed on in order to strengthen the roll, is some third-century cursive writing.
- 1393.** 7 × 9.8 cm. Fragment of a vellum leaf containing on one side beginnings of Π 157-70, on the other ends of 191-203, with frequent accents and marks of elision. Oxytone words received a grave accent on the final syllable, e.g. 165 αγαθόν. 166 δ inserted above the line by a second hand. Fifth century; in upright rather heavy uncials resembling those of 848. The leaf was ruled on the verso (?) with a fine point; brown ink.
- 1394.** Fr. I 4.3 × 1.6 cm. Six fragments (two unidentified), found with 1369-74, &c., from a papyrus book, containing on the recto parts of α 266-76 and on the verso parts of 296-307, with frequent accents, &c., added in darker ink. Oxytone words have a grave accent, as in 1393. Stops in the middle position in ll. 269 and 296 are apparently original. 271 πῦν with δη interlineated in darker ink. Fifth century; in a medium-sized sloping hand somewhat resembling that of 1372; brown ink.
- 1395.** 6.5 × 8.9 cm. Fragment of a vellum leaf containing on one side the first halves of ζ 264-75 and on the other 294-305, with frequent accents and marks of elision added in lighter ink. Stops in the high position occur. 269 σπειρας, the final s rewritten and repeated in lighter ink above the line. 273 φ of φημιν corrected; a paragraphus was inserted by a later hand below this line. 274 ι adscript of μωμενηι added together with a high stop by a later hand. εισὺν. 297 ελθ]ης corrected to ελθ]ηι by a later hand. 303 κευθωσι. Fourth century; in a fine upright script rather similar to that of the Codex Sinaiticus.
- 1396.** Fr. I 2.7 × 3.7 cm. Two fragments, found with 1369-74, &c., from a papyrus book, containing on the verso parts of ι 358-61, 364 and on the recto parts of 405-8, 410-12, with accents, &c., and three small unidentified scraps apparently from the same MS. 406 ηε apparently corr. 411 νο]ῦσον τ'. Fifth century; in a sloping hand rather smaller and more compressed than that of 1394; brown ink.
- 1397.** 3 × 2.8 cm. Fragment found with 1369-74, &c., containing on the verso marginal scholia on σ 67 and 70 in a small cursive hand. The text is [περιε]ζῶσα[το ²τα μηδεα τ[οις ³ρακεσιω, and after a space ηυξησεν, an explanation of ἡλδανε. On the recto traces of a few obliterated letters, probably also a scholium. Fifth century.
- 1398.** 10 × 7.3 cm. Beginnings of φ 356-67, from the bottom of a column, with frequent accents, breathings, &c., added by a later hand, which has also corrected the text and inserted paragraphi and critical signs. Below 361

paragraphus. 362 diplê in margin. δὴ. 363 λ of πλαγκτέ and χ of ταχ added above the line by the corrector. 364 ἀπ'. 365 ἡμῶν ἰλήκ[ησι, the λ added above the line by the corrector; paragraphus below. Third century; in calligraphic upright uncials of biblical type, resembling 1392, 661, &c.

VI. MINOR CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

1399. 7.1 × 7.3 cm. Plate II (verso). On the recto parts of 8 lines of, probably, a petition to an official who is addressed as κύριε; a ὑπομνηματισμός of a βασιλικὸς (γραμματεὺς) is mentioned. Late second or third century. On the verso the title

χοιριλου ποιηματα
κ
βαρβαρικα μηδι περσικα

is written in upright uncials which may belong to the middle or latter part of the third century. The papyrus is hardly the right shape for a σίλλυβος (cf. e. g. 301, 1091), and is more likely to have come from the end of a roll. With regard to l. 2, it is improbable that the three adjectives βαρβαρικὰ Μηδικ(ὰ) Περσικά refer to three distinct poems; they rather designate in common the famous epos of Choerilus which is called by Suidas ἡ Ἀθηναίων νίκη κατὰ Ξέρξου, by Stobaeus Περσηίς (*Flor.* xxvii. 1), and by Herodian Περσικά (Π. μον. λεξ. p. 13, ii. 919 Lentz). This was divided into more than one book (Herodian, *l. c.*), and may well have been of a rather wider compass than Suidas' title would suggest, though there are no indications of this in the few surviving fragments (Kinkel, *Ep. Gr. Fr.* pp. 265 sqq.). Suidas credits Choerilus with another work called Λαμιακά and ἄλλα τινὰ ποιήματα, of which nothing is known; Naeke in his monograph on Choerilus suggested (p. 101) that Λαμιακά should be emended to Σαμιακά or else assigned to Choerilus of Iasus.

1400. 6 × 5.3 cm. On the recto part of a second-century taxing-list, which will be described in Part XII. On the verso ends of 10 and beginnings of 8 lines from the tops of two columns of a comedy, written in a small uncial hand of the second or early third century. The text is:

Col. i.	Col. ii.
]αδε.	απο[
]αλην γαμει.	αυτη[
]τιδω.	μητηρ[

<p style="text-align: right;">] θεωι·</p> <p>5]ν δ αυτω^ο χρονοι·</p> <p style="text-align: right;">]σεται</p> <p style="text-align: right;">]τος ει</p> <p style="text-align: right;">]ρεμω :</p> <p style="text-align: right;">] κατω</p> <p>10]ην []</p> <p style="text-align: center;">.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">η γω δ[</p> <p>5 αυτα[</p> <p style="text-align: right;">απ[</p> <p style="text-align: right;">η . [</p> <p style="text-align: right;">εω[</p> <p style="text-align: center;">. . .</p>
---	---

1401. Fr. 1 8.5 × 6.6 cm. Four fragments, found with 1369-74, &c., from a papyrus codex of a tragedy, written in a hand similar to that of 1370 but not identical, though possibly from the same MS. of Euripides. Fifth century; brown ink. Frs. 1 and 2 are from the tops of columns. The text is:

	Fr. 1 recto.	Fr. 2 recto.	Fr. 3 verso.	Fr. 4 recto.
]αs	χορ(ος) ρο[. . [] . . [
]γνώμην ανα . . .		αφ[]ότιν[
]ενπα . . . [.] . .	verso.	τασ[
] . . [. . .] .] . θρων σοφόν	θηλ . [verso.
5]θισεις]s	5 σοι ξ . [] . απ[
] . αυω . . .] . α . . .	ιτι . []α . . [
		Traces of 2 more lines and 2 of a scho- lium.		

1402. Fr. 1 3.6 × 4.2 cm. Three fragments, found with 1369-74, &c., of a codex of Aristophanes (?) with semi-uncial scholia. The main text is in a different hand from those of 1371-4, and it is not quite certain that Fr. 3 belongs to this MS. Fifth century; brown ink. The text is:

Fr. 1 recto.	Fr. 1 verso.
<p>μ]αχουν</p> <p>]γωι·</p> <p>] . ισθε</p> <p>]ους ει</p> <p>] . γαον</p> <p>]υσεο()</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">] . οτε β[ο]υλοντα[ι</p> <p style="text-align: right;">τους αλ]εκτρονας π[ρος αλληλους</p> <p style="text-align: right;">μαχε]σθ(αι) σκοροδα τ[ιθεασιν εν</p> <p style="text-align: right;">τοις μ]υκτηρσιν [</p> <p>5] . εις πιγ[</p> <p style="text-align: right;">]υν κεα[</p> <p style="text-align: right;">]παρω[</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">. [</p> <p style="text-align: center;">ατ[</p> <p style="text-align: center;">κακ[</p> <p style="text-align: center;">. [</p>	

Fr. 2 recto.

]ο . () τα δρεπανα ε[
]ταζομενος*

verso.

] . . . λεγει
] κυνα

Fr. 3 recto.

] . ρ[
]πετ . [

Fr. 3 verso.

[.] . [.
π . [.
οι . . [.
το . . [.
5]γvs ιτω[

FR. 1 verso. 1-3 seem to be a note on σκόροδοι or σκοροδίσειν: cf. Schol. *Ach.* 165 τούτοις (sc. ἀλεκτρούσι) γὰρ ὅτε μέλλουσι μάχεσθαι σκόροδα δίδονται ἐσθίειν, *Knights* 494 ὅταν γὰρ εἰς μάχην συμβάλλωσιν αὐτοὺς σκόροδα διδόασιν αὐτοῖς, but the recto does not suit any point 30-50 lines distant from either of those two passages. Fr. 2 recto. 1 δρεπανα suggests *Frogs* 576 δρέπανον λαβοῦσ' and κυνα on the verso might refer to κυνόκλῆπον in l. 605. σκόροδα occurs in l. 555 of the same play, but Fr. 1 recto does not seem to fit that part of the *Frogs*.

1403. 2 × 3.2 cm. Fragment, found with 1369-74, &c., of the middle of a leaf from a papyrus codex, apparently in the hand of 1374, but not from the *Wasps*, though presumably Aristophanes. Fifth century. The text is:

Recto.

] . . [.
]υκκεν[
]υσαμενος [.
]νωτογ τ[

Verso.

] .
]
]τουυτ . [.
] . οικενα[ι ?
5] . . [.

1404. 5.9 × 16.9 cm. On the recto, written across the fibres, part of a Latin paraphrase of the fable of the dog carrying a piece of flesh over a stream and deceived by his own image in the water; cf. Aesop 339, Babrius 79, Phaedrus i. 4. The text is: *Canis carnem in v[e]nī et flu-²men t(r)ansiebat, deinde cum in ³aquam vidisset umbram car-⁴nis existima[v]it altera(m)*. There is a blank space of 2.5 cm. after l. 4 and no trace of writing below, which would be expected to be visible if other lines followed immediately. The story thus seems to have been left incomplete. Third century; in a rather large cursive hand. *e* is commonly of the v shape, made without lifting the pen, but twice has the form of *ε*. On the verso, at right angles, are the ends of four lines of Greek, perhaps an account.

APPENDIX

List of Oxyrhynchus and Hibeh Papyri distributed.

The following is a list of published papyri which have been presented to museums and libraries at home and abroad since the publication of the last list in Part V, pp. 315 sqq. It includes the texts in Parts V-IX, with a small portion of Part X, of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, and the remainder of those in Part I of the *Hibeh Papyri*. The reference numbers given to the papyri in the institutions to which they now belong have been added where ascertained. The following abbreviations are employed:—

- B. M. = British Museum. The numbers are those of the Catalogue of Greek Papyri.
 Bodl. = Bodleian Library, Oxford. The references are to the hand-list of MSS.
 Bolton = Chadwick Museum, Bolton, Lancs.
 Brussels = Musées Royaux, Brussels, Belgium.
 Cairo = Museum of Antiquities, Cairo, Egypt.
 Cambridge = University Library, Cambridge. The numbers refer to the 'Additions'.
 Chicago = Haskell Oriental Museum, University of Chicago, U.S.A.
 Cleveland = Library of Cleveland University, Ohio, U.S.A.
 Dublin = Library of Trinity College, Dublin.
 Edinburgh = University Library, Edinburgh.
 Glasgow = University Library, Glasgow.
 Graz = University Library, Graz, Austria.
 Harvard = University Museum, Harvard, Mass., U.S.A.
 Illinois = University Classical Museum, Illinois, U.S.A.
 Leipzig = University Library, Leipzig, Germany.
 Leland Stanford = Library of Leland Stanford University, San Francisco, California, U.S.A.
 Liverpool = University Library, Liverpool.
 Morgan = Pierpont Morgan Collection, New York, U.S.A.
 Muhlenberg = Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pennsylvania, U.S.A.
 Newton = Newton Theological Institute, Newton Centre, Mass., U.S.A.
 Pennsylv. = Museum of Science and Art, University of Pennsylvania, U.S.A.
 Princeton = University Library, Princeton, New Jersey, U.S.A.
 Princeton T. S. = Library of Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey, U.S.A.
 Rylands = The John Rylands Library, Manchester. The numbers are those of the Catalogue of Greek Papyri.
 Toledo = Museum of Art, Toledo, Ohio, U.S.A.
 Yale = Library of Yale University, U.S.A.

The following Oxyrhynchus and Hibeh Papyri had been passed on from Brussels to the University Library, Louvain, and have presumably been destroyed. They were numbered in the classical inventory of the University Museum 204-19.

Hibeh Papyri Nos. 39, 45.

Oxyrhynchus Papyri Nos. 419, 478, 488, 507, 509, 673, 679, 743, 836, 953, 973.

Oxyrhynchus Papyri.

- III. 412. B. M. 2040.
V. 840. Bodl. MS.
Gr. th. g. 11.
841. B. M. 1842.
842. B. M. 1843.
843. Cairo 41082.
844. Harvard.
VI. 845. Cairo 41083.
846. Pennsylv. E. 3074.
847. Morgan.
848. Chicago.
849. B. M. 2041.
850. Bodl. MS. Gr.
th. f. 13 (P).
851. Muhlenberg.
852. Bodl.
853. Cairo.
854. Toledo.
855. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. e. 99 (P).
857. Princeton CC.
0174. 6. 857.
858. Muhlenberg.
859. Liverpool Class.
Gr. Libr. 418.
860. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. f. 88 (P).
861. Newton.
862. Cairo.
863. Cairo.
864. Illinois G.P. 864.
865. Newton.
866. Muhlenberg.
867. Illinois G.P. 867.
868. Muhlenberg.
869. Toledo.
870. Muhlenberg.
871. Princeton CC.
0174. 6. 871.
872. Muhlenberg.
873. Yale.
874. Rylands 449.
875. Cleveland.
876. Princeton.
877. Pennsylv. E. 3075.
878. Brussels.
879. Cairo 41084.
880. Graz MS. II.
1948.
881. Cambridge Add.
5884.
882. Yale.
883. Morgan.
884. Bodl. MS. Lat.
class. e. 20 (P).
885. Cambridge.
886. Cairo.
887. Cairo.
888. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. d. 98 (P).
889. Cairo.
890. Illinois G.P. 890.
891. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. f. 89 (P).
892. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. d. 105 (P).
893. Glasgow.
894. B. M. 2042.
895. Glasgow.
896. Edinburgh Pap.
Case 5.
897. Illinois G.P. 897.
898. Princeton CC.
0174. 6. 898.
899. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. c. 65 (P).
901. Cambridge Add.
5885.
902. B. M. 2043.
903. Princeton T. S.
Pap. 1.
904. B. M. 2044.
905. Edinburgh Pap.
Case 6.
906. Edinburgh Pap.
Case 7.
907. B. M. 2040.
908. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. c. 64 (P).
909. Illinois G.P. 909.
910. Leland Stanford.
911. Muhlenberg.
912. Cairo.
913. B. M. 2045.
914. B. M. 2046.
915. Yale.
916. Illinois G.P. 916.
917. Yale.
918. B. M. 1843.
919. Cairo.
920. Cairo.
921. Cambridge Add.
5886.
922. Illinois G.P. 922.
923. Rylands 451.
925. Princeton T. S.
Pap. 2.
926. Bolton 28. 14. 1.
927. Illinois G.P. 927.
928. Illinois G.P. 928.
929. Cairo.
930. Glasgow.
931. Chicago.
932. Illinois G.P. 932.
933. Toledo.
934. Muhlenberg.
936. Toledo.
937. Cairo.
938. Chicago.
939. Cambridge Add.
5887.
940. Princeton CC.
0174. 6. 940.
941. Illinois G.P. 941.
942. Chicago.
943. Toledo.
944. Harvard.
945. Cairo 41085.
946. Morgan.
947. Hibbard Library,
Chicago, OAT. 2.
948. Pennsylv. E. 3076.
949. Graz MS. I.
1954.
950. Morgan.
951. Princeton.
952. Peabody Mu-
seum, Yale.
953. Louvain 218.
954. Leland Stan-
ford.
955. Yale.
956. Cleveland.
957. Brussels.
958. Illinois G.P. 958.
959. Cairo 41378.
960. Pennsylv. E. 3078.
961. Cairo 41379.
962. Illinois G.P. 962.
963. Toledo.
964. Cairo 41086.
965. Morgan.
966. Cairo.
968. St. Deiniol's,
Hawarden, A. N.
39496.
969. Cairo 41087.
970. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. g. 58 (P).
971. Illinois G.P. 971.
972. Cairo.
973. Louvain 219.
974. Yale.
976. Princeton CC.
0174. 6. 976.
977. Liverpool Class.
Gr. Libr. 421.
978. Pennsylv. E. 3077.
979. Graz MS. I.
1953.
981. Peabody Mu-
seum, Yale.
982. Princeton.
983. Dublin.
984. B. M. 1842.
986. Cairo.
987. Harvard.
988. Cambridge Add.
5888.
989. Cairo.
990. Illinois G.P. 990.
991. Princeton CC.
0174. 6. 991.
992. Graz MS. I.
1952.
993. Pennsylv. E.
3079.
994. Brussels.

995. Cairo.
 996. Graz MS. II.
 1942.
 997. Cambridge
 Add. 5889.
 998. Brussels.
 999. Graz MS. III.
 1941.
 1000. Graz MS. I.
 1951.
 1001. Chicago.
 1002. Morgan.
 1003. Cleveland.
 1004. Cairo 41088.
 1005. Cairo 41089.
 1006. Cairo 41090.
 VII. 1007. B. M.
 2047.
 1008. Cairo.
 1009. Cairo.
 1010. Bodl. MS. Gr.
 bib. *g.* 3 (P).
 1012. Toledo.
 1013. Cairo.
 1015. Cairo.
 1016. Toledo.
 1017. B. M. 2048.
 1018. Rylands 450.
 1019. Dublin.
 1020. Cairo.
 1021. Dublin.
 1022. B. M. 2049.
 1023. Illinois G. P.
 1023.
 1024. Illinois G. P.
 1024.
 1025. Bodl. MS. Gr.
 class. *d.* 99 (P).
 1026. Cairo.
 1027. Princeton CC.
 0174. 6. 1027.
 1028. Princeton CC.
 0174. 6. 1028.
 1029. Cairo.
 1030. Illinois G. P.
 1030.
 1031. Cairo.
 1032. Bodl. MS. Gr.
 class. *b.* 7 (P).
 1034. Dublin.
1035. Illinois G. P.
 1035.
 1036. Princeton CC.
 0174. 6. 1036.
 1037. B. M. 2050.
 1038. Muhlenberg.
 1039. Newton.
 1040. Princeton CC.
 0174. 6. 1040.
 1042. Illinois G. P.
 1042.
 1043. Princeton CC.
 0174. 6. 1043.
 1044. Toledo.
 1045. Toledo.
 1046. Muhlenberg.
 1047. Toledo.
 1049. Bodl. MS. Gr.
 class. *b.* 7 (P).
 1050. Cambridge
 Add. 5890.
 1051. Illinois G. P.
 1051.
 1052. Bodl. MS. Gr.
 class. *d.* 100 (P).
 1053. Cambridge
 5891.
 1054. Princeton CC.
 0174. 6. 1054.
 1055. Newton.
 1056. Newton.
 1057. Bodl. MS. Gr.
 class. *d.* 100 (P).
 1058. Princeton T. S.
 Pap. 3.
 1059. Newton.
 1060. Rylands 452.
 1061. B. M. 2051.
 1062. Bolton 28.14.2.
 1063. Toledo.
 1064. Muhlenberg.
 1065. Princeton T. S.
 Pap. 4.
 1066. Toledo.
 1067. Toledo.
 1068. Princeton CC.
 0174. 6. 1068.
 1069. Cairo.
 1070. Cambridge
 Add. 5892.
1071. Cairo.
 1072. Newton.
 VIII. 1073. B. M.
 2052.
 1074. Illinois G. P.
 1074.
 1075. B. M. 2053.
 1076. Rylands 448.
 1077. Muhlenberg.
 1078. Cambridge
 Add. 5893.
 1079. B. M. 2053.
 1080. Princeton T. S.
 Pap. 5.
 1081. Cambridge
 Add. 5894.
 1082. B. M. 2054.
 1083. Cambridge
 Add. 5895.
 1084. Princeton CC.
 0174. 6. 1084.
 1086. B. M. 2055.
 1087. Cairo.
 1088. B. M. 2055.
 1089. Bodl. MS. Gr.
 class. *d.* 101 (P).
 1090. Liverpool
 Class. Gr. Libr.
 420.
 1091. B. M. 2056.
 1092. Bodl.
 1093. Cairo.
 1094. Muhlenberg.
 1095. Muhlenberg.
 1096. Princeton T. S.
 Pap. 6.
 1097. B. M. 2057.
 1098. Cairo.
 1099. Cambridge
 Add. 5896.
 1100. Bodl. MS. Gr.
 class. *e.* 100 (P).
 1101. Bodl. MS. Gr.
 class. *c.* 66 (P).
 1102. B. M. 2058.
 1103. Bodl. MS. Gr.
 class. *d.* 102 (P).
 1104. Bodl. MS. Gr.
 class. *d.* 102 (P).
 1105. B. M.
1106. Edinburgh Pap.
 Case 8.
 1107. Princeton CC.
 0174. 6. 1107.
 1108. Muhlenberg.
 1109. Toledo.
 1110. Bodl. MS. Gr.
 class. *e.* 100 (P).
 1111. Bodl. MS. Gr.
 class. *f.* 90 (P).
 1112. Bodl. MS. Gr.
 class. *e.* 101 (P).
 1113. Muhlenberg.
 1114. B. M. 2059.
 1116. Bodl. MS. Gr.
 class. *d.* 103 (P).
 1117. Cairo.
 1118. Toledo.
 1119. Bodl. MS. Gr.
 class. *b.* 5 (P).
 1120. Illinois G. P.
 1120.
 1121. Cairo.
 1122. B. M. 2060.
 1124. Cambridge
 Add. 5897.
 1125. Newton.
 1127. Cairo.
 1128. Toledo.
 1129. B. M. 2061.
 1130. B. M. 2062.
 1131. Muhlenberg.
 1132. Princeton CC.
 0174. 6. 1132.
 1133. Cambridge
 Add. 5898.
 1134. B. M. 2063.
 1135. Cairo.
 1136. B. M. 2064.
 1137. Toledo.
 1138. Princeton T. S.
 Pap. 7.
 1139. Toledo.
 1140. Liverpool
 Class. Gr. Libr.
 421.
 1141. Muhlenberg.
 1142. Cairo.
 1143. B. M. 2065.
 1145. Cairo.

- | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| 1146. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. <i>e.</i> 102 (P). | 1181. Muhlenberg. | 1214. Princeton CC. | 1312. Muhlenberg. |
| 1147. Princeton CC.
0174. 6. 1147. | 1182. Cairo. | 0174. 6. 1214. | 1314. Liverpool
Class.Gr. Libr. 428. |
| 1148. Cairo. | 1183. Princeton CC.
0174. 6. 1183. | 1215. Muhlenberg. | 1315. Cambridge
Add. 5902. |
| 1149. Princeton CC.
0174. 6. 1149. | 1185. Rylands 454. | 1217. Muhlenberg. | 1319. Muhlenberg. |
| 1150. Rylands 453. | 1186. Cairo. | 1218. Toledo. | 1320. Liverpool
Class.Gr. Libr. 429. |
| 1151. Glasgow. | 1187. Cairo. | 1219. Muhlenberg. | 1321. Liverpool
Class.Gr. Libr. 430. |
| 1152. Princeton T.S.
Pap. 8. | 1188. B. M. 2071. | 1220. Cairo. | 1322. Liverpool
Class.Gr. Libr. 431. |
| 1153. Bolton 28.14.3. | 1189. Princeton CC.
0174. 6. 1189. | 1221. Muhlenberg. | 1324. Bolton 28. 14.
4. |
| 1154. Muhlenberg. | 1190. Dublin. | 1222. Toledo. | 1325. Princeton CC.
0174. 6. 1325. |
| 1155. Newton. | 1191. Cairo. | 1223. Cairo. | 1326. Illinois G. P.
1326. |
| 1156. Toledo. | 1192. Toledo. | X. 1225. Princeton
T. S. Pap. 12. | 1327. Cairo. |
| 1157. Cairo. | 1193. Princeton CC.
0174. 6. 1193. | 1226. Liverpool
Class. Gr. Libr.
424. | 1328. Newton. |
| 1159. Toledo. | 1194. Rylands 455. | 1227. Muhlenberg. | 1329. Cairo. |
| 1160. Muhlenberg. | 1195. Liverpool
Class. Gr. Libr.
423. | 1228. Glasgow. | 1330. Muhlenberg. |
| 1161. Newton. | 1197. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. <i>d.</i> 104 (P). | 1229. Illinois G. P.
1229. | 1331. Toledo. |
| 1162. Princeton CC.
0174. 6. 1162. | 1198. Newton. | 1230. Newton. | 1332. Toledo. |
| 1163. Dublin. | 1199. Edinburgh
Pap. Case 9. | 1243. Muhlenberg. | 1333. Muhlenberg. |
| 1164. Liverpool
Class.Gr. Libr. 422. | 1200. Cairo. | 1245. Cairo. | 1334. B. M. 2074. |
| 1165. Cairo. | 1201. Cambridge
Add. 5899. | 1246. Muhlenberg. | 1335. B. M. 2075. |
| IX. 1166. B.M. 2066. | 1202. Princeton CC.
0174. 6. 1202. | 1247. Toledo. | 1337. Cairo. |
| 1167. Princeton T.S.
Pap. 9. | 1203. Toledo. | 1249. Cambridge
Add. 5901. | 1338. Illinois G. P.
1338. |
| 1168. Princeton T.S.
Pap. 10. | 1204. Cairo. | 1250. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. <i>d.</i> 97 (P). | 1339. Cairo. |
| 1169. Princeton T.S.
Pap. 11. | 1205. B. M. 2072. | 1251. B. M 2057. | 1340. Newton. |
| 1170. Bodl. MS. Gr.
bib. <i>d.</i> 14 (P). | 1206. B. M. 2073. | 1301. Muhlenberg. | 1341. Cambridge
Add. 5903. |
| 1171. Princeton CC.
0174. 6. 1171. | 1207. Princeton CC.
0174. 6. 1207. | 1302. Muhlenberg. | 1342. Princeton CC.
0174. 6. 1342. |
| 1172. B. M. 2067. | 1208. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. <i>b.</i> 6 (P). | 1303. Liverpool
Class. Gr. Libr. 425. | 1345. Liverpool
Class.Gr. Libr. 432. |
| 1177. Illinois G. P.
1177. | 1209. Rylands 456. | 1306. Liverpool
Class.Gr. Libr. 426. | 1346. Toledo. |
| 1178. Cairo. | 1211. Princeton CC.
0174. 6. 1211. | 1307. Illinois G. P.
1307. | 1348. Toledo. |
| 1179. Newton. | 1212. Muhlenberg. | 1308. Muhlenberg. | 1349. Illinois G. P.
1349. |
| 1180. Illinois G. P.
1180. | 1213. Cambridge
Add. 5900. | 1309. Liverpool
Class. Gr. Libr. 427. | 1350. Cairo. |
| | | 1310. Princeton CC.
0174. 6. 1310. | |
| | | 1311. Newton. | |

Hibeh Papyri.

- | | | | |
|--|--|------------------|--|
| 1. B. M. 1821. | 3. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. <i>e.</i> 89 (P). | 5. B. M. 1823. | class. <i>d.</i> $\frac{7^8}{1.23}$ (P). |
| 2. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. <i>f.</i> 78 (P). | 4. B. M. 1822. | 6. B. M. 1824. | 8. Brussels. |
| | | 7. Bodl. MS. Gr. | 9. Harvard. |

- | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| 10. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. <i>f.</i> 79 (P). | 38. Graz MS. III.
1943. | 74. Graz MS. I.
1949. | 109. Cleveland. |
| 11. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. <i>g.</i> 54 (P). | 40. Graz MS. III.
1947. | 76. Brussels. | 110. Berlin Postmu-
seum I A, a 10 a. |
| 12. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. <i>g.</i> 55 (P). | 41. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. <i>c.</i> 61 (P). | 77. Leipzig Inv. No.
616. | 111. Morgan. |
| 13. Pennsylv. E. 3068. | 47. Cambridge Add.
4462. | 78. Cairo 41079. | 112. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. <i>c.</i> 63 (P). |
| 14. Bodl. | 48. Cambridge Add.
4463. | 80. B. M. 1831. | 113. Graz MS. I.
1946. |
| 15. B. M. 1825. | 50. Pennsylv. E. 3069. | 81. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. <i>c.</i> 62 (P). | 115. Brussels. |
| 17. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. <i>d.</i> 79 (P). | 51. B. M. 1829. | 82. B. M. 1832. | 116. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. <i>e.</i> 90 (P). |
| 18. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. <i>f.</i> 80 (P). | 52. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. <i>d.</i> 83 (P). | 84(a). B. M. 1833(a). | 117. Pennsylv. E. 3071. |
| 19. Graz MS. I and
III. 1944. | 53. Cambridge Add.
4464. | 84(b). B. M. 1833(b). | 119. Harvard. |
| 20. B. M. 1826. | 57. Cairo 41075. | 85. B. M. 1834. | 121. Graz MS. III.
1945. |
| 21. B. M. 1827. | 58. Morgan. | 87. Peabody Mu-
seum, Yale. | 124. Cairo 41081. |
| 22. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. <i>b.</i> $\frac{3}{2}$ (P). | 59. Cleveland. | 89. Morgan. | 128. Yale. |
| 23. Morgan. | 63. Cairo 41076. | 90. B. M. 1835. | 130. St. Deiniol's,
Hawarden A. N.
39495. |
| 24. Cambridge Add.
4461. | 64. Yale. | 91. Morgan. | 131. Leland Stanford. |
| 25. Yale. | 65. Leland Stanford. | 92. B. M. 1836. | 132. Graz MS. I.
1950. |
| 26. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. <i>d.</i> 80 (P). | 66. Cambridge Add.
4465. | 93. Harvard. | 133. Morgan. |
| 27. Dublin. | 67. B. M. 1830. | 94. Leipzig Inv. No.
617. | 137. Princeton. |
| 28. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. <i>d.</i> 81 (P). | 68. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. <i>d.</i> 84 (P). | 95. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. <i>f.</i> 81 (P). | 145. B. M. 1839. |
| 29. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. <i>d.</i> 82 (P). | 69. Cairo 41077. | 96. Pennsylv. E. 3070. | 146. Dublin. |
| 30. B. M. 1828. | 70 (a). Leipzig Inv.
No. 614. | 97. Yale. | 147. Cleveland. |
| 31. Cairo 41073. | 70 (b). Leipzig Inv.
No. 615. | 98. Brussels. | 148. Yale. |
| 32. Chicago. | 71. Cairo 41078. | 99. Princeton. | 150. B. M. 1840. |
| 33. Cairo 41074. | 72. Cambridge Add.
4466. | 100. Brussels. | 151. Morgan. |
| 34. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. <i>c.</i> 60 (P). | 73. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. <i>d.</i> 85 (P). | 101. Cairo 41080. | 156. Pennsylv. E. 3072. |
| | | 102. Harvard. | 166. Harvard. |
| | | 104. B. M. 1837. | 167. Pennsylv. E. 3073. |
| | | 105. Chicago. | 169. Hibbard Library,
Chicago, OAT. 1. |
| | | 106. B. M. 1838. | 171. B. M. 1841. |
| | | 107. Leipzig Inv. No.
618. | |
| | | 108. Chicago. | |

INDICES

I. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS (*including 1356*).

(*Figures in thick type refer to papyri, those in Italic type to fragments, Roman figures to columns; schol. = scholium.*)

- ἀγαθός 1361. 1. 6.
 ἀγαλμα 1361. 1. 5.
 ἀγανός 1358. 1. 7; 1359. 1. 10.
 ἄγγελος 1361. 5. 24.
 ἄγειν 1361. 1. 15; 1362. 1. 2, 3, 10; 1364. 20; 1368. 55.
 ἀγέρωχος 1358. 2. 30.
 ἀγιστός 1362. 1. 3.
 ἄγρός 1367. 17.
 ἀδελφός 1371. 47 schol.
 ἄδικος 1356. Fol. 4. 29; 1363. 7.
 ἀ]έλιος 1361. 5. 15.
 ἀήρ 1364. 294.
 [ἀθάνα]τος 1359. 1. 5.
 Ἀθηναῖοι 1366. 6; 1367. 41.
 ἀθρόος 1356. Fol. 10. 18.
 αἶα 1359. 1. 11.
 αἰγλάεις 1361. 1. 14.
 Αἴγυπτος 1361. 1. 15.
 Ἄιδης 1356. Fol. 4. 34; 1360. 3. 4 (Ἄιδας); 1363. 11.
 αἰέν 1362. 1. 9.
 αἰθήρ 1358. 2. 34.
 Αἰθίοπες 1358. 2. 15, 17.
 αἴθο[1359. 3. 3.
 αἴθυια 1362. 1. 34.
 αἰθύσσειν 1361. 1. 8 (1. (δι)αιθ.).
 αἶνος 1362. 1. 9.
 αἰπύς 1358. 2. 23, 25.
 αἰρεῖσθαι 1365. 53.
 αἶσα 1362. 1. 15.
 αἶσσειν 1358. 2. 20.
 αἰσχύνη 1364. 40.
 αἰτεῖν 1362. 1. 19.
 αἰ]τιος 1366. 17.
 Αἶτνα 1361. 4. 7. Αἶτνη 1358. 2. 25.
 αἰφνίδιος 1365. 36.
 αἰών 1362. 1. 33.
 ἀκούειν 1356. Fol. 8. 1; 1359. 1. 4; 1362. 1. 21; 1364. 70.
 ἄκρατος 1356. Fol. 8. 5.
 ἀκρο[1361. 17. 2.
 ἀλαζών 1363. 7.
 ἀλγύνειν 1364. 108, 149.
 ἀλεισον 1362. 1. 13.
 ἀλεκτρύων 1402. 1. verso schol.
 Ἀλέξανδρος 1361. 1. 1 marg.
 ἀλήθεια 1356. Fol. 4. 30; 1364. 56.
 ἀληθής 1356. Fol. 4. 27; 1362. 1. 15; 1364. 118.
 ἀλής 1363. 5.
 ἀλικία 1361. 24. 4.
 ἀλιτρός 1360. p. 56.
 ἀλλά 1356. Fol. 4. 31, 34, Fol. 8. 10, Fol. 10. 11; 1358. 2. 33; 1360. 1. 3, 2. 6 schol.; 1361. 5. 12; 1362. 1. 9, 16, 33; 1364. 55, 120, 162; 1368. 42.
 ἀλλήλων 1364. 273.
 ἄλλος 1356. 2. 6, 3. 1; 1365. 5; 1366. 8; 1367. 8.
 ἀλμυρός 1358. 1. 1.
 alter 1404. 4.
 ἀλύσκειν 1358. 2. 29.
 [Ἀλφει]ός 1361. 4. 9.
 ἄμα 1368. 37, 40.
 Ἀμαζονίδες 1359. 1. 12.
 ἀμενηνός 1358. 2. 18.
]αμετρα 1363. 19.
 ἄμμος 1360. 1. 8, 10.
 ἀμύμων 1358. 1. 14; 1359. 4. 6.
 ἀμύνεσθαι 1364. 132.
 Ἀμύντας 1361. 1. 1 marg.
 ἄμυστις 1362. 1. 11.
 ἀμφί 1358. 2. 28.
 ἀμφιβάλλειν 1358. 1. 27.
 ἄμφω 1368. 32.
 ἄν 1356. Fol. 4. 5; 1364. 9, 12, 38, 113, 131, 135, 146, 165.
 ἀνάγιος 1356. Fol. 4. 10.
 ἀνάγκα 1361. 1. 6. ἀνάγκη 1361. 5. 14.
 ἀναγκάζειν 1356. Fol. 4. 9.
 ἀναγκαῖος 1364. 26, 283.
 ἀναδιδάσκειν 1356. Fol. 10. 3.
 ἀναιρεῖν 1368. 32.
 ἀναξ 1358. 2. 32.
 ἀναπνεῖν 1364. 292.
 ἀνάσσειν 1358. 1. 16.
 ἀναστρέφεισθαι 1362. 1. 6.
 ἀναφέρειν 1364. 184.
 Ἀνδρέας 1365. 11.
 ἀνδρεία 1365. 56.
 ἀ[νδρείως 1365. 63.
 ἀνδροκτασίη 1359. 1. 17.
 ἀνδροφόνος 1358. 1. 29.
 ἀνείρεσθαι 1362. 1. 22.
 ἀνήκειν 1361. 4. 1.
 ἀνήρ 1356. Fol. 4. 12; 1358. 1. 9, 12; 1361. 1. 10, 4. 6; 1363. 2, 12, 22; 1366. 6, 27.
 ἄνθεμον 1361. 4. 3.

- ἀνθιστάται 1360. 2. 4 schol.
 ἀνθρώπιος 1356. Fol. 4. 2.
 ἄνθρωπος 1356. Fol. 8. 2;
 1358. 1. 20; 1361. 1. 12,
 3. 3, 24. 2, 5 (?); 1364.
 13, 48, 89, 236, 284;
 1365. 2.
]ανοεῖν 1356. 3. 14.
 ἀνοιγνύειν 1368. 47.
 ἀνόσιος (αποφω Pap.) 1356.
 Fol. 4. 10.
 ἀντί 1356. Fol. 8. 2; 1360.
 13. 2 schol.; 1365. 43.
 Ἄντισθένης 1366. 2.
 ἀντιφαίνειν 1359. 1. 5.
 ἄνω 1356. Fol. 4. 1 (?);
 1358. 2. 35.
 ἀνωφελής 1364. 165.
 ἀξι[1356. Fol. 10. 28.
 ἀπαλλάσσειν 1364. 41.
 ἀπαρχή 1360. 1. 13.
 ἄπας 1356. Fol. 4. 25; 1364.
 295; 1365. 31.
 ἀπειρέσιος 1358. 2. 10.
 ἀπό 1356. Fol. 10. 9; 1361.
 1. 15; 1364. 87, 96, 99,
 102; 1368. 29.
 ἀποδεικνύειν 1365. 45.
 ἀποδιδόναι 1365. 7.
 ἀποθνήσκειν 1364. 93, 98.
 ἀποκρι[1356. Fol. 4. 43.
 ἀποκτείνειν 1365. 38.
 ἄπ[ορος 1360. 1. 9.
 ἀποστο[1356. Fol. 8. 28.
 ἀποστουγεῖν 1362. 1. 11.
 ἀποτεί[1356. Fol. 10. 20.
 ἀποτρέπειν 1364. 88.
 ἀποφεύγειν 1367. 8.
 ἀποχετεύειν 1356. Fol. 10. 9.
 aqua 1404. 3.
 ἄρα 1358. 1. 1, 2. 33.
 Ἄργεῖοι 1358. 1. 31.
 ἄρδειν 1356. Fol. 10. 10.
 ἀρετή 1356. Fol. 4. 4, Fol.
 10. 22.
 Ἄρητιάδης 1358. 2. 32.
 ἀριστερός 1358. 1. 25.
 ἄριστος 1359. 1. 11.
 Ἄρκασιδης 1359. 1. 8.
 ἀρμόττειν 1356. Fol. 4. 11, 30.
 ἀρνεῖσθαι 1364. 197.
 ἀρπαγή 1356. 1. 2.
 ἀρπάζειν 1361. 5. 19.
 ἄρτος 1362. 1. 25.
 ἀρυστήρ 1362. 1. 17.
 ἄρχειν 1364. 134.
 ἀρχή 1365. 63.
 Ἄρχιμαχος 1367. 56.
 Ἄσις 1359. 1. 11.
 ἀσύνητος 1360. 1. 10.
 ἀτᾶσθαι 1358. 2. 13 (?).
 Ἄτθις 1362. 1. 4.
 ἀτιμώρητος 1356. Fol. 4. 29.
 ἀτ[ιτάλλειν 1359. 1. 6.
 ἀτμήν 1362. 1. 19.
 ἀτρύγετος 1358. 2. 34.
 αὔθις 1365. 70; 1368. 41.
 αὔλιον 1362. 4. 6.
 αὐξάνειν 1397. 70 schol.
 αὐτάρ 1359. 2. 13.
 αὐτε 1356. Fol. 4. 39.
 αὐτίκα 1361. 1. 11.
 αὐτός 1359. 4. 7; 1360. 4.
 ii. 7; 1364. 67, 69, 73,
 76, 79, 82, 95, 133, 138,
 142, 148; 1365. 13, 44,
 54, 60; 1367. 3, 45, 54,
 59; 1368. 45, 48, 51;
 1400. i. 5, ii. 2. ὁ αὐτός
 1364. 194; 1368. 28.
 ἀφανίζειν 1368. 38.
 ἄφθιτος 1358. 1. 26; 1359.
 5. 1.
 ἀφιέναι 1356. Fol. 4. 30;
 1360. 2. 6 schol.
 ἀφικνεῖσθαι 1368. 43.
 ἀφορίζειν 1364. 290.
 Ἄφροδίτη 1359. 5. 4; 1371.
 52 schol.
 ἄφρων 1356. Fol. 4. 8.
 Ἄχαιοί 1359. 1. 14.
 ἄως 1361. 24. 3.
 βαθύρροος 1358. 2. 23.
 βάλλειν 1362. 1. 20; 1368.
 51.
 βαρβαρικά 1399. verso 2.
 Βάρβαρος 1356. Fol. 10. 11 (?);
 1364. 278, 289.
 βαρβαροῦν 1364. 274.
 βάρβιτος 1361. 1. 1, 4. 2.
 Βαρκαῖοι 1367. 29.
 βασιλεύειν 1367. 42.
 βασιλεύς 1359. 1. 8; 1367.
 20, 27.
 βασιλικ[ός 1367. 62.
 βιάζεσθαι 1364. 47.
 βιβλίον 1363. 7.
 βίη 1359. 1. 9, 17.
 βίος 1356. Fol. 4. 29; 1362.
 1. 33.
 βλάπτειν 1364. 55, 119.
 βλέπειν 1368. 42.
 βλώσκειν 1361. 5. 25; 1362.
 1. 7.
 βοηθεῖν 1365. 37.
 Βουζύγης 1367. 53.
 βούλεσθαι 1402. 1. verso
 schol.
 βουλευτής 1367. 65.
 βραβεύειν 1356. Fol. 4. 32.
 Βύκχις 1360. 3 schol.
 βωμός 1360. 1. 11; 363. 10.
 βωτιάνειρα 1359. 1. 16.
 canis 1404. 1.
 caro 1404. 1, 3.
 cum 1404. 2.
 γαῖα 1358. 2. 32. Γαῖα 1358.
 2. 11.
 γαμεῖν 1400. 1. 2.
 γάρ 1356. Fol. 4. 11, 16, 29,
 32, 37, Fol. 10. 27; 1360.
 3 schol.; 1361. 2. 1, 4. 2,
 26. 4; 1362. 1. 11, 17;
 1363. 8; 1364. 23, 54,
 65, 91, 117, 189, 211,
 272, 294.
 γᾶρως 1361. 1. 2.
 γε 1364. 173.
 γείνεσθαι 1364. 136.
 γενεή 1362. 1. 14.
 γενέθλη 1358. 2. 19, 26;
 1362. 1. 7.
 γέρας 1359. 5. 1.
 γέρων 1363. 7.
 γῆ 1359. 1. 13; 1363. 23.
 γηγενής 1367. 42.
 γήτειον 1362. 1. 25.

- γίγνεσθαι 1356. Fol. 4. 26 ;
 1358. 2. 16, 27 ; 1359.
 2. 6 ; 1360. 2. 6 schol. ;
 1364. 159, 210 ; 1365. 12,
 25.
 γιγνώσκειν 1356. Fol. 8. 1 ;
 1362. 1. 29.
 Γλαυκίτης 1368. 33, 39.
 γλυκύς 1361. 1. 6.
 γλώσσα 1358. 2. 14. γλώττα
 1364. 72.
 γνήσιος 1356. 3. 13.
 γνώμη 1401. 1. 2.
 γοήτρης (?) 1356. Fol. 4. 14.
 γονεύς 1359. 7. 3.
 γούν 1356. Fol. 4. 31.
 γυμνάζειν 1356. Fol. 4. 47.
 γυμνός 1356. Fol. 4. 37.
 γυνή 1356. Fol. 4. 14 ; 1359.
 5. 5 (?) ; 1368. 53.
 γυρευσαι (= φυτεύσαι?) 1356.
 Fol. 10. 8.

 δαήμων 1358. 1. 24.
 δαήναι 1362. 1. 14.
 δαίτη 1362. 1. 5.
 δαμᾶν 1358. 1. 2.
 Δάρδανος 1359. 2. 7, 13.
 δέ 1356. Fol. 4. 33, Fol. 8.
 24, 28, Fol. 10. 5, 12, 25 ;
 1358. 1. 1, 6, 18, 22, 30,
 2. 29 ; 1359. 1. 6, 7, 13,
 19 ; 1360. 1. 10, 2. 2,
 4 schol. ; 1361. 1. 12-14,
 3. 4, 5. 6, 12. 4, 13. 4 ;
 1362. 1. 5, 7, 12, 21, 25 ;
 1363. 15 ; 1364. 21 *et*
saep. ; 1365. 8 *et saep.* ;
 1367. 8 *et saep.* ; 1368.
 33, 36, 37, 39 ; 1400. i. 5.
 δείλος 1362. 4. 4.
 δειλός 1361. 13. 2.
 δεῖν 1356. Fol. 10. 27 ; 1364.
 66-82, 120.
 Δελφικός τρίπους 1356. Fol.
 4. 27.
 Δελφοί 1365. 7 ; 1367. 23.
 δεόντως 1356. Fol. 4. 5.
 δεσμός 1356. Fol. 4. 35 ;
 1364. 104.

 δεῦρο 1361. 1. 3.
 δεῦτε 1363. 5.
 δέχεσθαι 1359. 1. 7 (?).
 deinde 1404. 2.
 Δημήτηρ 1359. 2. 9, 12.
 δήμος 1365. 69.
 δημο[σι . . 1356. Fol. 10. 29.
 δημότης 1365. 1.
 Δημόναξ 1367. 19, 28, 35.
 διά 1356. Fol. 4. 38 ; 1358.
 2. 34 ; 1359. 1. 22 ; 1364.
 54, 56 ; 1365. 55 ; 1368.
 53.
 διαβαίνειν 1368. 45.
 διαδατείσθαι 1358. 1. 15.
 (δι)αθύσσειν 1361. 1. 8.
 δισσ[1361. 3. 3.
 δισσασθαι 1365. 17.
 διακωλύειν 1364. 179.
 διατελεῖν 1365. 16.
 διαφθείρειν 1367. 18.
 διαφυλάσσειν 1365. 65.
 δίδοναι 1356. Fol. 4. 31, 33,
 Fol. 10. 28 ; 1358. 1. 3 ;
 1360. 5. 4 ; 1364. 191 ;
 1367. 24, 38.
 δικάζειν 1356. Fol. 4. 37.
 δίκαιος 1358. 1. 13 ; 1364.
 61, 171.
 δικαιοσύνη 1364. 6, 16.
 δικαστής 1356. Fol. 4. 34.
 δίκη 1356. Fol. 4. 30 ; 1364.
 193 ; 1366. 17 ; 1367. 3.
 διό 1367. 2.
 Διόθεν 1358. 1. 28.
 Διομήδης 1359. 4. 5.
 Διονύσια δῶρα 1361. 1. 9.
 διορθοῦν 1367. 58.
 δῖς 1358. 2. 28.
 δίσκος 1359. 4. 8.
 δισχέλιοι 1360. 5. 7.
 διφυής 1367. 42.
 δῖω 1359. 1. 4.
 δοκεῖν 1356. Fol. 4. 25 ; 1361.
 1. 12.
 δόλος 1358. 1. 2.
 δόξα 1364. 54.
 δοῦλος 1362. 1. 1.
 δρᾶν 1364. 76, 134, 177,
 182, 188, 196, 209.

 δρέπανον 1402. 2. recto schol.
 δύνασθαι 1360. 2. 4 schol. ;
 1364. 192, 214, 287 (?).
 δυνατός 1356. Fol. 10. 26 ;
 1364. 46.
 δῶρον 1358. 1. 3, 6 ; 1361.
 1. 9.

 εἰν 1364. 45, 47, 51.
 εἰαυτοῦ 1356. Fol. 4. 25, 37 ;
 1364. 14 ; 1366. 4 ; 1371.
 41 schol.
 ἐγώ 1361. 4. 13 ; 1362. 8,
 13, 21, 22, 31 ; 1366. 10 ;
 1368. 31 ; 1400. ii. 4.
 ἡμεῖς 1356. Fol. 4. 7, 34,
 Fol. 8. 30 ; 1360. p. 56
 (ἄμμι) ; 1362. 4. 17 ; 1364.
 291.
 ἐθέλειν 1360. 1. 6 ; 1362. 1.
 16.
 εἰ 1356. Fol. 4. 31, 33 ;
 1359. 1. 4 ; 1361. 4. 7 ;
 1362. 1. 33 ; 1364. 16,
 156 ; 1368. 41.
 εἰδέναι 1356. Fol. 4. 7, Fol.
 10. 23 (?) ; 1358. 1. 5, 26 ;
 1360. 13 ; 1362. 1. 27.
 εἶδος 1370. 1370 schol.
 εἰκάδες 1361. 1. 5.
 εἰκός 1365. 19 ; 1368. 34.
 εἰλικρινῶς 1356. Fol. 4. 38.
 εἶναι 1356. Fol. 4. 26, Fol.
 8. 25, 2. 10 ; 1358. 1.
 28, 2. 19 ; 1360. 2. 6
 schol. ; 1361. 5. 12 ; 1362.
 1. 7, 32 ; 1364. 31 *et*
saep. ; 1365. 1, 10, 19,
 20, 31 ; 1368. 44, 54 ;
 1400. i. 7.
 εἶρηνη 1356. Fol. 11. 2.
 εἰς 1360. 3. 4 ; 1362. 1. 18 ;
 1364. 138, 183, 294 ;
 1367. 7, 11 ; 1368. 44, 55.
 εἰς 1367. 32.
 ἐκ (ἐξ) 1356. Fol. 4. 27, 37,
 Fol. 8. 28 ; 1359. 2. 14 ;
 1363. 23 ; 1364. 170,
 268 ; 1365. 6, 36 ; 1367.
 38 ; 1368. 54.

ἕκαστος 1356. Fol. 4. 12.
 ἑκατόν 1367. 4, 10.
 ἕκινος 1368. 5, 31, 42.
 ἐκπλήσσειν 1368. 33.
 ἐκτρέπειν 1368. 29.
 Ἐκτωρ 1358. 1. 29.
 ἐκφεύγειν 1358. 2. 29.
 ἐλάττων 1364. 50, 151.
 ἐλάττωσις 1364. 164.
 ἐλαύνειν 1356. Fol. 4. 8;
 1361. 5. 17; 1368. 37, 40
 ἐλεύθερος 1362. 1. 19; 1364.
 107.
 ἐλέφας 1361. 1. 13.
 Ἑλλην 1356. Fol. 10. 11;
 1364. 279, 292.
 ἐλπίζειν 1363. 23.
 ἐλπὶς 1361. 1. 8.
 ἐμός 1361. 1. 3; 1362. 1. 33.
 ἔμπειρος 1356. Fol. 10. 1.
 ἐμπνέειν 1356. Fol. 8. 26.
 ἐμφλέγειν 1356. Fol. 4. 36.
 ἐν 1356. Fol. 4. 4, 32-4, 40;
 1359. 1. 6, 9, 11; 1361.
 1. 5, 5. 6; 1362. 1. 5,
 17, 20; 1364. 9, 148,
 272; 1365. 31; 1368.
 47, 53.
 ἐναίρειν 1359. 1. 12.
 ἐναντιοῦσθαι 1364. 163.
 ἐναργής 1359. 1. 5.
 ἔνδον 1361. 5. 5.
 ἐνεῖναι 1364. 148 (ἐνι).
 ἔνεκα 1364. 57. ἔνεκεν 1362.
 1. 25.
 ἐνενήκοντα 1367. 4.
 ἐνέπειν 1362. 1. 27.
 ἐνεργός 1365. 32.
 ἐνθουσιᾶν 1356. Fol. 4. 27.
 ἐνταῦθα 1356. Fol. 4. 33;
 1364. 178.
 ἐντεῦθεν 1364. 2, 17.
 ἐντός 1363. 8.
 ἐ]ξαρκ[1363. 28.
 ἐξεῖναι 1364. 150, 152, 154;
 1367. 33 (?).
 ἐξελαύνειν 1359. 1. 13.
 existimare 1404. 4.
 ἐπαιδεῖσθαι 1364. 266, 270.
 ἐπεὶ 1364. 275.

ἐπειδὴ 1365. 22.
 ἔπειτα 1365. 58.
 ἐπέξοδος 1356. Fol. 4. 9.
 ἔπεσθαι 1358. 1. 18.
 ἐπέτειος 1362. 1. 3.
 ἐπί 1358. 2. 8; 1359. 1. 15;
 1361. 24. 4; 1364. 65-
 81, 90, 186; 1368. 51.
 ἐπίθετος 1364. 25.
 ἐπιθυμῆναι 1364. 83.
 ἐπικουρεῖν 1364. 172.
 ἐπικούρησις 1364. 158.
 ἐπικουρος 1358. 1. 23.
 ἐπιμέλεια 1356. Fol. 4. 2.
 ἐπιμορφάζειν 1356. Fol. 4. 13.
 ἐπινεύειν 1368. 36, 38.
 ἐπίστασθαι 1356. Fol. 10. 21.
 ἐπιστρέφειν 1368. 40.
 ἐπιτάξ 1362. 1. 9.
 ἐπιτάσσειν 1365. 6.
 ἐπιτομή 1367. 68.
 ἐπιτρέπειν 1364. 174.
 ἐπιφέρειν 1367. 3, 9.
 ἐπιχειρεῖν 1368. 52.
 ἐπιχθ[ον 1361. 27. 2.
 ἔπος 1362. 1. 15.
 ἐπτὰ σοφοί 1367. 71.
 ἐπτάτονος 1361. 1. 2.
 ἔργον 1358. 2. 8.
 Ἐρίκτυπος 1358. 2. 19.
 ἐρισθενής 1358. 2. 27.
 Ἐριχθόνιος 1359. 2. 14, 4.
 3 (?).
 Ἐρμιππος 1367. 69.
 εἰς 1361. 1. 3, 4. 7; 1362. 1.
 5, 10; 1363. 5; 1367.
 23. Cf. εἰς.
 ἐσοικίζεσθαι 1362. 1. 34.
 ἐσσήν (ἐσσήν Pap.) 1362. 1.
 23.
 ἔσω 1356. Fol. 4. 41 (?).
 ἐταίρη 1363. 16.
 ἕτερος 1356. Fol. 8. 21;
 1362. 1. 29; 1364. 141.
 ἔτι 1360. 2. 6 schol.; 1362.
 1. 16; 1365. 48 (?);
 1368. 43.
 εὖ 1358. 1. 17; 1359. 1. 6;
 1364. 139; 1365. 60.
 εὐβουλία 1356. Fol. 4. 15.

εὐδαιμονέστατος 1356. Fol. 4.
 26.
 εὐδοκιμεῖν 1365. 40; 1367. 46.
 εὐηφε]νής 1358. 1. 12.
 εὐθύς 1356. Fol. 4. 31.
 εὐίππος 1358. 2. 21.
 εὐκαταφρόνητος 1356. Fol. 4.
 24.
 εὐκτιτος 1361. 4. 7.
 εὐλύρας 1361. 12. 4.
 εὐπλόκαμος 1359. 4. 5.
 εὐρίσκειν 1364. 146.
 εὐρύς 1358. 1. 16.
 Εὐρώπη 1358. 1. 8.
 εὐσέβεια 1356. Fol. 10. 24.
 εὖτε 1361. 1. 6, 5. 25; 1362.
 1. 14.
 εὐτελής 1368. 48.
 εὐτυχία 1365. 67.
 εὐφραίνειν 1364. 112.
 εὐχεσθαι 1356. Fol. 10. 2, 27.
 εὐχή 1356. Fol. 10. 20, 23.
 ἐφίεσθαι 1356. Fol. 11. 5.
 ἔχειν 1356. Fol. 11. 6; 1361.
 5. 5; 1362. 1. 8, 16, 25,
 33; 1365. 61.
 ἔως 1360. 2. 6 schol.

flumen 1404. 1.

ζάθεος 1361. 20. 4.
 Ζεὺς 1358. 1. 2, 15, 21, 26,
 2. 12; 1360. p. 56; 1361.
 4. 14; 1363. 6.
 ζημία 1364. 41.
 ζῆν 1356. 3. 15; 1364. 92,
 95.
 ζωπυρεῖν 1356. Fol. 4. 36.
 ἦ 1362. 1. 15, 32.
 ἦ 1356. Fol. 4. 7, Fol. 10. 4,
 10, 28; 1361. 1. 20; 1362.
 1. 28; 1364. 90, 112, 116,
 188.
 ἠγήτωρ 1358. 1. 12.
 ἠδέ 1359. 1. 6, 7. 3 (?).
 ἠδεῖν 1364. 116, 152. ἠδεσθαι
 1362. 1. 12.
 ἠδη 1361. 4. 2 (?); 1366. 14.
 ἠετίων 1359. 2. 8, 11.

- Ἡλέκτρη 1359. 2. 5.
 ἤλεκτρον 1358. 2. 24.
 ἡλικία 1365. 16, 24.
 ἡλιτοεργός 1360. 6. 3.
 ἡμαρ 1362. 1. 2.
 ἡμίθεος 1361. 20. 6.
 Ἡρακλείδης Σαραπίωνος 1367. 67.
 Ἡρακλεΐη βίη 1359. 1. 9.
 Ἡριγόνη 1362. 1. 4.
 Ἡριδανός 1358. 2. 23 (?).
 Ἡρόδοτος 1367. 36.
 ἥρωσ 1361. 5. 20; 1362. 1. 26.
 ἡττάσθαι 1356. Fol. 4. 15.
 ἡττων 1364. 151.
 Ἡφαιστος 1358. 1. 4.
 ἡώς 1362. 1. 1.
 θάλπειν 1361. 1. 7.
 θάνατος 1366. 4, 18.
 θάπτειν 1368. 28.
 θεά 1361. 5. 22.
 θέλειν 1356. Fol. 4. 24.
 θεοπο[μπ] 1361. 9. 3.
 θεοπρόπιον 1367. 39.
 θεός 1356. Fol. 4. 6, 15, 16, Fol. 8. 2, Fol. 10. 22, 27; 1358. 1. 9, 2. 13; 1362. 1. 10; 1365. 8; 1400. 1. 4.
 Θευγένης 1362. 1. 21.
 θρασύχειρ 1361. 5. 10.
 Θρηΐκιος 1362. 1. 11.
 θρίξ 1361. 5. 6.
 θρώσκειν 1358. 2. 32.
 θυγάτηρ 1359. 1. 7, 4. 2; 1371. 47 schol.
 θῦμος 1361. 1. 7; 1362. 1. 21.
 θύνειν 1358. 2. 20.
 θυσία 1365. 5.
 ἰαμβος 1363. 17.
 ἴδιος 1362. 1. 7. ιδιώτερος 1364. 186.
 ἰέναι 1364. 80.
 ἰερός 1360. 2. 4 schol. ἱρόν 1363. 5.
 Ἰέρων 1361. 4. 1 marg., 3.
 ἰκάνειν 1359. 6. 2.
 ἰκανός 1364. 172.
 Ἰκάριος 1362. 1. 3.
 Ἰκιος 1362. 1. 8.
 ἰκνεῖσθαι 1359. 1. 19.
 Ἰκος 1362. 1. 24.
 Ἰλος 1359. 2. 15.
 ἰμερόεις 1361. 4. 5.
 in 1404. 2.
 invenire 1404. 1 (?).
 ἰππημολγοί 1358. 2. 15.
 ἵππος 1359. 1. 10; 1361. 4. 4; 1368. 50.
 ἰππόστασις 1368. 46, 55.
 ἱρόν 1363. 5.
 ἴς 1358. 1. 16.
 ἴσος 1359. 1. 7; 1361. 3. 4.
 ἴσως 1356. Fol. 10. 5.
 ἰχάινειν 1362. 1. 22.
 καθά 1356. Fol. 4. 26.
 καθεύδειν 1368. 52.
 καθῆσθαι 1361. 19. 6.
 κάθοδος 1362. 1. 26.
 καθύπερθεν 1358. 2. 14.
 καὶ γάρ 1362. 1. 11.
 καινός 1362. 1. 6; 1366. 6.
 καιρός 1356. Fol. 4. 12, 33; 1365. 32.
 κακία 1356. Fol. 4. 36.
 κακοπατρίδας 1360. 1. 12.
 κακός 1364. 51, 137. κακόν 1365. 66. κακῶς 1364. 153.
 καλεῖν 1362. 1. 5.
 καλλίκομος 1358. 1. 10.
 καλλικρήδεμνος 1361. 5. 22.
 καλλιστεύειν 1356. Fol. 4. 4.
 καλλίσφυρος (-ραν) 1361. 5. 24 schol.
 κάλλος 1359. 4. 4.
 καλός 1368. 32.
 καλυκῶπις 1361. 5. 11.
 κ]αλυπτ[1360. 22. 2.
 Καλυψώ 1358. 2. 31.
 Καμβύσης 1356. Fol. 10. 13.
 κάμι[ειν] 1366. 29.
 καπνός 1360. 2. 6 schol.
 καρτερός 1361. 5. 13 schol.
 κατά 1356. Fol. 4. 25, Fol. 10. 17 (?), 2. 4; 1359. 7. 4; 1360. 28 schol.; 1361. 1. 14, 24. 5; 1362. 1. 7; 1364. 60, 296-7; 1365. 58, 62; 1367. 32; 1368. 39; 1371. 41 schol.
 καταδεῖν 1368. 49.
 καταδικάζειν 1367. 12.
 καταδίκη 1367. 14.
 καταθρόσκειν 1365. 34.
 κατακαλύπτειν 1371. 11 schol.
 καταλαμβάνειν 1356. Fol. 4. 39.
 καταλείπειν 1364. 195.
 κατανοεῖν 1356. Fol. 4. 38.
 καταπαύειν 1360. 2. 6 schol.; 1361. 1. 2 (κάππαυε).
 κατάρατ[ος] 1361. 5. 4.
 κατασβεννύγειν 1360. 2. 6 schol.
 κατασκευάζειν 1356. Fol. 11. 2.
 καταυλεῖν 1363. 3.
 καταφρονεῖν 1365. 10.
 κατηγορεῖν 1364. 204.
 κατηγορία 1364. 206.
 κατιέναι 1368. 53.
 κατόμνυσθαι 1364. 140, 143.
 κατόπισθεν 1359. 1. 18.
 κατοργᾶν 1356. Fol. 4. 21 (?).
 Κατουδαῖοι 1358. 2. 9, 18.
 κάτω 1358. 2. 33; 1368. 55; 1400. 1. 9.
 κε 1362. 5. 4.
 κείθ[εν] 1362. 3. 1.
 κείνος 1359. 1. 13; 1362. 1. 28.
 κείσθαι 1364. 63, 103; 1368. 30.
 Κέκροψ 1367. 41.
 κένωσις (κενεσις Pap.) 1371. 52 schol.
 κεφαλά 1360. 2. 3; 1361. 5. 6.
 Κεφαλλῆνες 1358. 2. 30.
 κῆδος 1358. 1. 30.
 κισσύβιον 1362. 1. 12.
 κλεωνός 1361. 4. 8 (?).
 κλίμαξ 1368. 54.
 κλισίη 1362. 1. 8.
 κλοπή 1356. 1. 2.
 κλύειν 1358. 2. 33.
 κλυτός 1359. 1. 21, 24 (?); 1361. 4. 3.
 κλυτοτέχνης 1358. 1. 4.
 κόρη 1361. 5. 9, 11, 19; 1368. 32.

Κόρινθος 1367. 11.
κόσμος 1356. Fol. 10. 24.
κούρα 1361. 4. 13.
κρατερός 1358. 1. 14; 1359.
4. 6; 1361. 5. 13.
κράτος 1368. 39.
κρείττων 1356. Fol. 4. 35.
κρείων 1358. 2. 19.
κρήδεμνον (κραδ.) 1361. 1. 11.
κρίνειν 1358. 1. 22.
Κροῖσος 1356. Fol. 4. 25.
Κρονίων 1358. 1. 11, 16.
κυβερνήτης 1356. Fol. 4. 11.
κύκλος 1358. 2. 20.
κυκλοῦν 1358. 2. 28.
κύλιξ 1361. 1. 7.
κύμα 1362. 1. 34.
Κύπρις 1361. 1. 8.
Κυρηναῖοι 1367. 21, 38.
κύων 1402. 2. verso schol.
κάμη 1368. 44.
κῶς 1362. 1. 24.

Λαιστρυγόνιος 1358. 2. 26.
λαιψηρός 1361. 4. 9.
λαμβάνειν 1367. 6.
λαμπρότερος 1360. 2. 6 schol.
-ον 1365. 49.
λανθάνειν 1362. 1. 1; 1364.
38, 43, 49.
Λαομέδων 1359. 1. 10.
λαός 1358. 1. 19, 22.
Λᾶσος 1367. 55.
Λατοῖδας 1360. 1. 11.
λαχ[1361. 1. 19.
λέγειν 1362. 1. 13, 22, 31;
1364. 73, 145; 1367. 21;
1371. 41 schol.; 1402. 2.
verso schol. εἰπεῖν 1356.
Fol. 4. 5, Fol. 10. 14, 3. 4;
1361. 27. 1.
λέσχη 1362. 1. 16.
λεύκιππος 1361. 24. 3.
λευκός 1362. 1. 2.
Λιβύη 1367. 34.
Λίβυς 1358. 2. 15.
λιγναχίς 1361. 4. 1.
λιγυρός 1361. 1. 2.
λογισμός 1356. Fol. 4. 10,
Fol. 10. 16.

λόγος 1364. 1. 109, 3. 5.
λύειν 1356. Fol. 4. 35; 1361.
1. 11.
λυπεῖν 1364. 115.
μάγειρος 1365. 20.
μαινόλις 1361. 11. 2.
μακρός 1356. Fol. 4. 28.
μάλα 1362. 1. 15. μάλλον
1356. Fol. 10. 28; 1362.
1. 34; 1364. 111, 116,
150. μάλιστα 1364. 13;
1365. 41, 55.
μαντείον 1365. 4.
Μαντινεῖς 1367. 20, 27, 31,
37.
μάντις 1356. Fol. 4. 28.
μαρμαίρειν 1361. 1. 13.
μάρπτειν 1358. 2. 29.
μάρτυς 1356. Fol. 10. 12;
1364. 17, 21.
μάσσων 1361. 6. 3.
ματεῖν 1360. 2. 3.
μάχεσθαι 1402. 1. verso schol.
μεγάθυμος 1358. 2. 17; 1359.
1. 12.
μεγαλήτωρ 1358. 1. 19.
μεγαλόνοια 1356. Fol. 4. 6.
μεγαλ[οσθενής 1361. 1. 17.
μέγαρον 1359. 1. 6.
μέγας 1364. 19. μείζων 1364.
53. μέγιστος 1361. 1.
15.
μειγνύναι 1359. 1. 9; 1361.
1. 9.
μελάνο[1358. 2. 10.
μέλας 1358. 2. 17; 1359. 1.
15.
μέλειν 1366. 24.
μελε[1356. Fol. 10. 22.
μέλλειν 1359. 1. 4; 1361. 4.
2; 1365. 9.
μέν 1358. 2. 14; 1359. 2.
10 (?); 1361. 1. 11; 1362.
1. 11, 13; 1364. 17, 23,
28, 95, 102, 174; 1365.
5, 16, 31, 55, 68; 1366.
6; 1367. 11; 1368. 35.
μὲν οὖν 1364. 156.
μέντοι 1356. Fol. 4. 33.

μέριμνα 1361. 1. 10.
μέροψ 1358. 1. 20.
μετά 1364. 17; 1367. 14;
1368. 31. μέτα 1362. 1.
32.
μεταξύ 1360. 3 schol.
μεταχρόνιος 1358. 2. 35.
μετρέιν 1356. Fol. 10. 29.
μέχρι 1365. 15.
μή 1356. Fol. 4. 31, 33; 1360.
1. 12, 2. 6 schol.; 1364.
10, 42, 84, 99, 133, 142,
155, 161, 180.
μηδέ 1356. Fol. 10. 8, 26.
Μηδικά 1399. verso 2.
μῆδος 1358. 1. 26; 1397. 67
schol.
μηκέτι 1361. 1. 1.
μήπω 1361. 4. 1.
μήτηρ 1400. ii. 3 (?).
μητίετα 1358. 1. 15, 21.
μιαιφόνος 1361. 5. 10.
μικρόν 1368. 29.
μικροψυχία 1356. Fol. 4. 5.
μιμνήσκειν 1367. 34, 54.
μιν 1362. 1. 18, 4. 5.
μῖσος 1360. p. 56.
μοναρχεῖν 1361. 1. 12.
μόνος 1356. Fol. 4. 7, 11;
1360. 2. 6 schol., 7. μόνον
1356. Fol. 10. 11; 1362.
1. 15; 1368. 36.
μονοῦν 1364. 20.
μοῦσα 1363. 13. Μοῦσαι 1361.
1. 4, 4. 3; 1363. 4.
μυθεῖσθαι 1362. 1. 30.
μῦθος 1359. 1. 4.
μυκτῆρ 1402. 1. verso schol.
Μυρμιδόνες 1362. 1. 23.
Μυσοί 1359. 1. 8.
μύστης 1360. 2. 4 schol.
Μυτιληναῖοι 1360. 2. 6 schol.
Μυτιλήνη 1360. 3 schol.

ναιετάω 1358. 1. 17.
ναῦς 1359. 1. 15, 2. 16; 1361.
1. 15.
ναυτιλίη 1362. 1. 33.
νεανίσκος 1368. 37.
νεκρός 1360. 2. 4 schol.

- νέος* 1361. 1. 6, 12. 3.
νήις 1362. 1. 33.
νηλής 1359. 4. 8 (?).
νίκα 1361. 4. 10.
νικᾶν 1365. 47.
νιν 1361. 5. 3, 12.
νόμιμος 1364. 8, 36.
νομοθετεῖν 1364. 63; 1367. 22, 44, 53.
νομοθέτης 1367. 39, 70.
νόμος 1356. Fol. 4. 24; 1364. 18, 24, 28, 60, 88, 103, 160, 166, 171; 1367. 45, 57.
νόος 1358. 2. 14. Cf. *νοῦς*.
νοστο[1359. 3. 1.
νοῦς 1364. 81.
νυ 1362. 1. 5.
νύμφη 1358. 1. 10, 2. 31.
νῦν 1363. 2; 1364. 167.
νύξ 1368. 43.

ὁ (art.) 1360. 1. 4, 7, 8; *al.*
ὁ (dem.) 1358. 2. 29, 33; 1359. 2. 10; 1362. 1. 5, 11, 13; 1363. 3.
ὁ (rel.) 1359. 2. 14, 4. 7; 1360. 1. 13; 1362. 1. 17.
]ογενής 1366. 1.
ὄδε 1362. 1. 13, 15, 22.
ὀδός 1368. 29.
ὀθνεῖος 1362. 4. 6.
οἴσθαι 1356. Fol. 4. 31.
οἰκείος 1365. 65. *οἰκειότερος* 1364. 86.
οἰκειοῦσθαι 1365. 51.
οἰκία 1367. 18.
οἶκος 1361. 1. 13; 1364. 269; 1370. 1371 schol.
οἰκτιστος 1362. 1. 4.
οἶνοποτεῖν 1362. 1. 12.
οἶνος 1361. 26. 3; 1362. 1. 16.
οἶνοχόος 1362. 1. 18.
οἴχεσθαι 1367. 12.
ὀκόσος 1363. 12.
ὀλβιος 1361. 5. 18; 1362. 1. 32.
ὀλίγος 1362. 1. 12.
ὀλος 1356. Fol. 4. 38, Fol. 8. 31.

ὀμήθης 1362. 1. 5.
Ὀμηρικός 1362. 1. 9.
ὀμοιος 1362. 1. 9, 10. *ὀμοίως* 1364. 277.
ὀμολογεῖν 1364. 29, 33, 39.
ὀμοφ[ων 1361. 12. 3.
ὀνινάναι 1364. 110.
ὄνομα 1365. 14.
ὄπως 1360. 1. 12 schol.
ὀρᾶν 1356. Fol. 4. 28; 1362. 1. 19; 1364. 52, 67; 1368. 41, 46.
ὀργίζεσθαι 1371. 3 schol.
Ὀρέστειοι χόες 1362. 1. 2.
Ὀρθαγόρας 1365. 15.
ὀρθός 1364. 109.
ὀρμαίνειν 1361. 1. 3.
ὀρούειν 1358. 2. 30.
Ὀρτυγίη 1358. 2. 26.
ὄς 1356. Fol. 4. 5, 35, Fol. 10. 29, Fol. 11. 6 (?); 1359. 1. 5, 2. 9; 1361. 1. 9; 1362. 1. 6, 8; 1363. 15; 1364. 38, 66, 90, 173; 1365. 15, 44; 1368. 54.
ὄσος 1356. Fol. 10. 26.
ὄσοσπερ 1364. 204.
ὄσσος 1361. 4. 14; 1362. 1. 21.
ὄστις 1363. 17, 20; 1364. 131, 135.
ὄταν 1361. 26. 2.
ὄτε 1362. 1. 1, 19; 1402. 1. verso schol.
ὄτι 1356. Fol. 4. 7; 1362. 1. 15; 1364. 59.
ὄττι 1360. 1. 7.
οὐ 1356. Fol. 4. 7, 24, Fol. 10. 11, 21; 1360. 1. 9; 1362. 1. 10, 15. *οὐκ* 1362. 1. 9, 17; 1364. 165, 264 marg. *οὐχ* 1364. 33, 172.
οὐδ 1358. 1. 18; 1359. 1. 5.
οὐδέ 1356. Fol. 4. 38, Fol. 10. 5; 1360. 1. 10; 1362. 1. 1, 18; 1364. 86, 113.
οὐδέις 1356. Fol. 4. 29, 32, Fol. 8. 24; 1360. 2. 4 schol.; 1364. 50, 53, 85, 185, 216 (?), 291; 1367. 15; 1368. 35.
οὐν 1356. Fol. 4. 25; 1364. 12, 36, 84, 156 (*μὲν οὐν*); 1368. 43, 49.
οὐδέπω 1360. 2. 6 schol.
οὐκέτι 1368. 42.
οὐκουν 1364. 107, 113.
οὐνεκα 1359. 2. 12.
οὐνομα 1362. 1. 14.
οὐς 1362. 1. 30 (*οὔατα*); 1364. 69.
οὔτε 1362. 1. 29; 1364. 178, 270, 271, 289, 292.
οὔτος 1356. Fol. 10. 10, 3. 8 (?); 1360. 1. 11, 2. 6 schol.; 1361. 7. 4; 1362. 1. 31; 1364. 58, 123, 144, 272; 1365. 46; 1366. 16; 1367. 7, 64; 1368. 35, 45, 53. *οὔτως* 1365. 19.
ὀφθαλμός 1364. 65.
ὀφρα 1358. 2. 13.
ὀφρύς 1362. 1. 18.
ὀψέ 1356. Fol. 4. 31, 32.

Παγχαῖος (*Πάγκαιο[ν* Pap.) 1363. 6.
πάγχρυσος 1361. 4. 14.
πάθημα 1356. Fol. 4. 7.
πάθος 1356. Fol. 4. 36.
παιδεύειν 1365. 18.
παιδίον 1365. 13.
παιπαλόεις 1358. 2. 25.
παῖς 1361. 1. 17; 1362. 1. 3, 26; 1365. 23.
πάλαι 1363. 6.
πανομφαῖος 1358. 2. 12.
πανούργος 1356. Fol. 8. 44.
παρά 1356. Fol. 4. 34, Fol. 10. 29; 1358. 1. 10; 1364. 46, 160; 1367. 5; 1368. 44. *πάρα* 1362. 1. 21.
παραβαίνειν 1364. 11, 37.
παραγίγνεσθαι 1367. 23.
παραθήγειν 1356. Fol. 4. 8.
παραλλάσσειν 1365. 24.
παραμελεῖν 1365. 3.
παραμετρεῖν 1356. Fol. 4. 6.
παρατηρεῖν 1356. Fol. 10. 25.

- παρέχειν 1364. 242, 281.
 παριστάναι 1356. Fol. 10. 19.
 πᾶς 1356. Fol. 4. 33; 1359.
 1. 13; 1360. 1. 9, 29
 schol.; 1361. 1. 12; 1364.
 7, 48, 52, 57, 276, 284;
 1365. 40.
 πάσσαλος 1361. 1. 1.
 παστᾶς 1370. 1371 schol.
 πάσχειν 1364. 131, 154, 155,
 175, 176, 180, 181, 187,
 191, 208.
 πατήρ 1358. 1. 1, 9; 1360.
 p. 56; 1361. 5. 6 schol.,
 12, 19. 8.
 πάτριος 1362. 1. 23.
 παῦρος 1362. 1. 32.
 πείθεσθαι 1364. 167.
 πειθῶ 1364. 207(?).
 πελάζειν 1359. 1. 16.
 Πέλληνεῖς 1365. 30, 35.
 πέλωρος 1358. 2. 11.
 πέμπειν 1361. 1. 3, 10, 4. 6.
 πεντήκοντα 1367. 10.
 περᾶν 1358. 1. 1; 1364. 189.
 περί 1356. Fol. 4. 15; 1358.
 2. 20, 28; 1362. 1. 28;
 1367. 69.
 περιαθρεῖν 1356. Fol. 4. 12.
 περιάπτον 1356. Fol. 4. 39.
 περιζώννυσθαι 1397. 67 schol.
 περιπόλ[αρχος 1365. 44.
 περίπολος 1365. 26, 42.
 περιστείχειν 1362. 1. 13.
 Περσικά 1399. verso 2.
 πηγῆ 1356. Fol. 10. 9.
 πηδαλιουχεῖν 1356. Fol. 10. 4.
 Πηλεύς 1362. 1. 24.
 πιθουγίς 1362. 1. 1.
 πίνειν 1361. 1. 16.
 πλάζειν 1363. 6.
 πλατάνιστος 1368. 30.
 πλατύς 1360. 2. 2.
 πλείων 1364. 153.
 πληγ[1362. 4. 3.
 πλήθειν 1371. 45 schol.
 πλήθος 1365. 59.
 πλοῦτος 1361. 1. 16.
 ποιεῖν 1356. Fol. 4. 9; 1364.
 139; 1365. 68.
 ποίημα 1399. verso 1.
 ποιητής 1367. 55.
 ποικίλλειν 1370. 1371 schol.
 ποιμήν 1358. 1. 19.
 πολεῖν 1358. 2. 28.
 πολέμαρχος 1365. 54.
 πολεμεῖν 1365. 61.
 πολέμιος 1364. 147; 1365.
 38, 48, 67. πολεμῖος 1364.
 62.
 πολέμος 1358. 1. 24; 1365.
 28, 58.
 πόλις 1358. 1. 17; 1360. 1.
 8; 1361. 1. 11; 1364. 7;
 1367. 7.
 πολιτεύεσθαι 1364. 9.
 πολίτης 1365. 22, 50, 60;
 1367. 16.
 πολὺς 1358. 1. 18, 22; 1360.
 1. 5; 1363. 21; 1364. 59,
 146; 1365. 40, 50, 66.
 πλείων 1364. 153.
 πολυσπερής 1358. 2. 22.
 πολύφορβος 1358. 2. 22.
 πόμα 1362. 1. 20.
 πόντος 1361. 1. 14.
 Ποσειδάσιος 1361. 5. 16.
 Ποσειδάων 1358. 2. 27, 31.
 ποταμός 1368. 45.
 ποτέ 1359. 2. 9, 4. 7; 1361.
 20. 3.
 πότνια 1358. 2. 31.
 που 1368. 41.
 πούς 1358. 2. 35; 1361. 4. 9,
 10. 3; 1364. 78.
 πρᾶγμα 1356. Fol. 4. 3.
 πραπίδες 1358. 1. 5.
 πρέπειν 1356. Fol. 10. 24.
 πρό 1356. Fol. 8. 9; 1363. 5.
 προέρχεσθαι 1365. 53.
 προθεσπίζειν 1356. Fol. 4. 28.
 προῖεναι 1360. 2. 7.
 πρὸς 1356. Fol. 4. 8, 29,
 Fol. 10. 13; 1363. 11;
 1364. 1. 273, 4. 7; 1365.
 30, 60; 1367. 1. 13 and
 3. 4; 1368. 35, 50.
 προσάγεσθαι 1365. 51.
 προσεῖναι 1356. Fol. 4. 10.
 πρόσθεν 1361. 4. 8.
 προσίεσθαι 1364. 157, 162,
 169.
 προσνέμειν 1367. 29.
 προστασία 1356. Fol. 4. 2.
 πρότερον 1356. Fol. 4. 40.
 προτρέπειν 1364. 9.
 πρῶτον 1364. 173; 1367. 43.
 πτερόν 1361. 1. 4.
 Πτολεμαῖος (grammarian)
 1361. 5. 13 schol.;
 (= Ptol. Soter) 1367. 6.
 Πυγμαῖοι 1358. 2. 9, 18.
 Πυθαγόρας 1367. 72.
 πυροφόρος 1361. 1. 14.
 Πύρρα 1360. 3 schol.
 πῶλεῖν 1367. 13.
 πῶλος 1361. 4. 8 (?).
 ῥά 1359. 4. 7.
 ῥαδάμανθης 1358. 1. 13.
 ῥάκος 1397. 67 schol.
 ῥέεθρον 1358. 2. 23.
 ῥιζοῦν 1356. Fol. 10. 6.
 ῥίς 1364. 297.
 ῥυπαρός 1371. 44 schol.
 σαίνειν 1362. 1. 19.
 Σαραπίων 1367. 68.
 σέβεσθαι 1362. 1. 23; 1364.
 267, 271.
 σεύεσθαι 1361. 1. 7.
 σῆμα 1358. 1. 25.
 σιγᾶν 1360. 2. 4 schol.
 Σικυώνιοι 1365. 29, 43, 69.
 σκέψις 1364. 58.
 σκοπεῖν 1364. 280.
 σκόροδον 1402. 1. verso schol.
 Σκύθαι 1358. 2. 15.
 σός 1361. 1. 4; 1362. 1. 28.
 σοφός 1401. 2. verso 1. ἐπτά
 σ. 1367. 71.
 στάτηρ 1360. 5. 7.
 στείχειν 1359. 1. 16.
 στεφαναφο[ρ 1361. 12. 2.
 στιβάς 1368. 48, 51.
 στόμα 1364. 296.
 σύ 1360. 2. 4 schol.; 1362.
 1. 21; 1401. 3. verso 5.
 ὑμεῖς 1360. 3 schol.; 1362.
 1. 23 (ἔμμι); 1366. 23.

- συκοφαντ[1366. 7, 13.
 συμβάλλειν 1365. 36.
 συμβιοῦν 1356. Fol. 4. 13.
 συμμα[χ 1367. 26.
 συμπίπτειν 1367. 19.
 συμπόσιον 1361. 1. 5.
 συμπότης 1361. 4. 6.
 συμφέρειν 1364. 97, 99, 101,
 114, 118, 122.
 συμπερόντως 1364. 15.
 συμφορά 1360. p. 56.
 σύμφυτος 1364. 44.
 σύν 1356. Fol. 4. 40; 1361.
 26. 1.
 συνθε[1361. 24. 1.
 συνιστάται 1365. 28.
 Συρακόσιος 1361. 4. 1 marg.
 σῶμα 1356. Fol. 4. 35.
 σωφροσύνη 1356. Fol. 11. 1.
 τάλαντον 1367. 5, 9.
 τάλας 1361. 5. 2.
 ταλ[1361. 8. 1.
 τανίσφυρος 1358. 1. 8.
 ταχέως 1360. 2. 6 schol.
 τε 1358. 1. 9, 13-14, 2. 12,
 14, 15, 17, 26, 28, 34;
 1359. 1. 4, 13, 17, 4. 6;
 1361. 1. 8, 13, 4. 10, 12. 4;
 1364. 45, 48, 51, 65, 72,
 76, 79, 82, 109, 148, 150,
 183, 267, 294; 1365. 64;
 1367. 17.
 τειχίζειν 1362. 5. 1.
 τείχος 1363. 5 (τειχευς).
 τεκμαίρεσθαι 1364. 24.
 τέκος 1361. 5. 18.
 τελείν 1356. Fol. 10. 23;
 1361. 4. 5.
 τέλος 1356. Fol. 4. 28.
 τελ[1361. 5. 3.
 τέρας 1358. 1. 28.
 τετρακόσιοι 1367. 66.
 τήλε 1358. 1. 8.
 Τήλεφος 1359. 1. 8.
 τιθέναι 1358. 1. 30; 1361. 4.
 15, 20. 2; 1365. 14;
 1367. 56, 59; 1402. 1.
 verso 3 (?).
 τίκτειν 1361. 5. 13 and schol.
 τιμᾶν 1359. 1. 7; 1371. 52
 schol.
 τιμή 1358. 1. 18; 1365. 47.
 τιμωρία 1364. 183.
 τίς 1361. 26. 4; 1362. 1. 23,
 25.
 τις 1356. Fol. 4. 32, 40;
 1360. 1. 12, 3 schol.;
 1361. 1. 3; 1362. 1. 7;
 1363. 9, 14, 18; 1364. 10,
 146, 156; 1365. 39; 1366.
 9, 19 (?); 1367. 2, 57.
 τοίνυν 1364. 121.
 τοιοῦτος 1364. 157, 170.
 τοκεύς 1360. 6. 5.
 τοσα[1361. 20. 1.
 τόσσος 1361. 24. 4.
 τότε 1359. 1. 5; 1361. 4. 13,
 12. 3.
 τραγωδός 1363. 13.
 transire 1404. 2.
 τρέπειν 1359. 1. 14.
 τρέφειν 1359. 1. 6, 11; 1365.
 13.
 τρίπους 1356. Fol. 4. 27.
 τρίσμακαρ 1362. 1. 32.
 τρίτος 1362. 1. 14.
 τρυφή 1371. 52 schol.
 Τρῶες 1358. 1. 23.
 Τρω[1361. 20. 3.
 τυγχάνειν 1365. 46. ὁ τυχών
 1361. 3. 4; 1365. 21.
 τυραννεύειν 1360. 2. 6 schol.
 τυραννίς 1365. 8.
 τύραννος 1360. 2. 4 schol.
 τυρανν[1356. Fol. 4. 46.
 ὕδωρ 1358. 1. 1; 1362. 1.
 15.
 υἱός 1358. 2. 16, 27; 1365.
 20; 1368. 3 (?).
 umbra 1404. 3.
 ὑμνεῖν 1361. 4. 8.
 ὑπάρχειν 1367. 15.
 ὑπέρ 1356. Fol. 10. 30.
 Ὑπερβόρειοι 1358. 2. 21.
 ὑπερμενής 1358. 1. 11, 16.
 ὑπερῶν 1368. 54.
 ὑπό 1356. Fol. 4. 39, Fol.
 11. 7; 1361. 5. 6 schol.;
 1364. 106; 1367. 37, 59;
 1368. 30.
 ὑπόδημα 1370. 1370 schol.
 ὑφιέναι 1358. 2. 13.
 ὑψοτάτω 1361. 1. 10.
 videre 1404. 3.
 φαίνειν 1358. 1. 25. φαίνεσθαι
 1364. 168.
 φάται 1356. Fol. 4. 16, 27;
 1360. 3 schol.; 1367. 56.
 φάνερος 1360. 1. 13.
 φάος 1362. 1. 4. Cf. φῶς.
 φάρμακον 1362. 1. 20; 1366.
 3 (?).
 φάτην 1368. 50.
 φαῦλος 1364. 268; 1365. 2;
 1368. 49.
 φέγγος 1361. 24. 5.
 φέρβειν 1358. 2. 22.
 φέρειν 1358. 1. 6; 1360. 3
 schol.
 Φερένκος 1361. 4. 9 and schol.
 φθέγγεσθαι 1368. 34.
 φθόνος 1363. 14.
 φιλιώτερος 1364. 86.
 φίλος 1360. 6. 5 (?); 1366.
 30.
 φιλοσοφία 1356. Fol. 4. 13.
 φιλότης 1359. 1. 9.
 Φιλόχορος 1367. 47.
 φιλ[1366. 7.
 φλαῦρος 1360. 12. 3.
 φοβεῖν 1359. 1. 20.
 Φοῖ[βος 1361. 12. 4.
 Φοῖνιξ 1358. 1. 7.
 φορεῖν 1362. 1. 17.
 φρήν 1361. 1. 8.
]φρονο[1361. 1. 21.
 φρουρεῖν 1365. 27.
 φύειν 1364. 30, 32, 277.
 φυλάσσειν 1360. 1. 11; 1361.
 1. 1.
 φύλον 1358. 2. 30; 1359.
 1. 12.
 φύσις 1356. Fol. 4. 32, 2. 1;
 1361. 28. 1; 1364. 22, 26,
 32, 44, 63, 85, 92, 105, 106,
 111, 122, 148, 275, 282.

φυτεύειν (γυρευσαι Pap.) 1356.
Fol. 10. 8 (?).

φυτόν 1356. Fol. 10. 8.
φῶς 1360. 2. 6 schol.

χαίτα 1361. 28. 2.

χαλεπός 1362. 1. 20.

χαλκομίτρας 1361. 5. 8.

χαλκοχίτων 1359. 1. 14.

χανδόν 1362. 1. 11.

χαρίεις 1365. 33.

Χάριτες 1361. 9. 1.

χαριτ[1361. 2. 2.

χαρ[1361. 42. 2.

χείρ 1361. 1. 3; 1364. 75.

χθών 1359. 1. 16.

Χοιρίλος 1399. verso 1.

χορός 1401. 2. recto 1 marg.
χοῦς, χόες Ὀρέστειοι 1362.
1. 2.

χρέος 1362. 1. 7.

χρήμα 1371. 52 schol.

χρησθαι 1356. Fol. 4. 11;
1364. 12; 1367. 61.

χρηστός 1367. 58.

χρόνος 1361. 5. 12; 1365.

52; 1400. i. 5.

χρῦσεος 1361. 1. 4.

χρυσόλοφος 1361. 5. 7.

χρυσόπεπλος 1361. 4. 2.

χρυσός 1361. 1. 13.

χώρα 1365. 28, 64.

ψευδής 1362. 1. 10.

ψήχειν 1363. 7.

ψυχή 1356. Fol. 4. 1, 37.

ῥ 1360. 2. 6 schol.; 1361. 1.

1, 16; 1366. 6, 27 (?).

ῶκός 1361. 5. 24.

ῶνείσθαι 1367. 17.

ῶς 1356. Fol. 4. 31; 1359.

1. 19; 1362. 1. 10, 27;

1363. 22; 1364. 191,

219 (?); 1367. 5, 37 (?).

ῶς 1360. 1. 2, 6; 4. ii. 8.

ῶς 1361. 1. 16.

ῶσπερ 1360. 2. 4 schol.;

1365. 19; 1368. 34.

ῶστε 1365. 49 (?).

ῶστ[1361. 18. 3.

ῶφελείν 1364. 120.

II. PERSONAL NAMES.

Ἀθήνη 1380. 30, 72.

Ἀννιαγή 1357. 21, 44.

Ἀπόλλων 1380. 210; 1381.
232.

Ἄρποκράτης 1380. 136.

Ἄρτεμις 1380. 84.

Ἀσκλήπιος 1381. 26, 189,
228, 246.

Ἀσπάρτη 1380. 116.

Ἀταργάτη (-τει Pap.) 1380.
100.

Ἀφροδίτη 1380. 9, 22, 35, 38,
45, 67.

Βίκτωρ 1357. 20.

Βούβαστις 1380. 4.

Γαβριήλ 1357. 54.

Δικτυννίς 1380. 82.

Διόσκουροι 1380. 235.

Ἐκάτη 1380. 108.

Ἐλένη 1380. 112.

Ἐπίμαχος 1357. 6.

Ἐρμῆς 1381. 230.

Ἐσερέμφις 1380. 46.

Ἐστία 1380. 23, 73.

Εὐφημία 1357. 41, 56.

Ζαχαρίας 1357. 52.

Ζεύς 1382. 20, 22.

Ἡλιος 1382. 22.

Ἡρα 1380. 26, 32, 34, 60,
68.

[Ἡραΐς], ἄμα [Ἡ.] 1357. 40 (?).

Ἡφαιστος 1380. 2; 1381. 229.

Θαῦηστις 1380. 68.

Θαψ[ε]ῦσις 1380. 105.

Θέμις 1380. 83.

Θεό[δοτος] 1357. 63.

Θε[όδωρος] 1357. 65.

Ἰαὼ Σαβαώθ 1384. 28.

Ἰερημίας 1357. 46.

Ἰησοῦς 1384. 17.

Ἰμούθης 1381. 202.

Ἰουλιανός 1357. 48.

Ἰούστος 1357. 10, 13.

Ἰσις 1380. 23, 33 (?), 76,
81, 115, 143.

Ἰσίων 1357. 22.

Ἰώ 1380. 64, 143.

Καλεοῖβις 1381. 231.

[Κόλλουθος] 1357. 6.

Κόρη 1380. 72, 105.

Κοσμᾶς 1357. 22.

Λατίνα 1380. 104.

Λητώ 1380. 79.

Μαῖα 1380. 39, 42, 103, 116.

Μαρία 1357. 30, 45, 68.

Μενχόρης 1381. 30. Μενεχέρης
1381. 223.

Μηνᾶς 1357. 11.

Μιχαήλ 1357. 8, 39.

Μοῦχισ (?) 1380. 45.

Ναναία 1380. 106.

Νεκτενίβις 1381. 1.

Νεχαύτης 1381. 7.

Νούπ, ἄπα N. 1357. 56.

Ὀνε[1380. 1.

Ὀσιρις 1380. 162, 198, 242.

Παλέντρα (?) 1380. 115.

Παῦλος] 1357. 34. Πέτρος 1357. 33. Πραξιδική 1380. 50.	Ταχνηψίς 1380. 75. T[. .]β[ί]α 1380. 114.	Ἔωρος 1380. 210, 222, 233, 234, 246, 250; 1381. 230.
Σαβαώθ 1384. 28. Σάραπισ 1382. 20, 22. Σαρκοῦνις 1380. 119. Σερῆνος 1357. 4, 28, 53. Συρίων 1382. 23. Σῶθις 1380. 144.	Φθᾶ 1381. 201. [Φιλόθεος] 1357. 43. Φιλόξενος 1357. 24, 38, 58, 64. Φοιβάμμων 1357. 3, 6, 35, 36, 43, 57. Χριστός 1357. 30, 36 (?).]αθροίχις 1380. 14.]λε . εθεῦς 1380. 282.]οιωεανεῦς 1380. 296.]τααβδεῦς 1380. 286.]φίς 1380. 47.]χμεῦνις 1380. 3.

III. GEOGRAPHICAL.

(Where no number of the papyrus is given the reference is to 1380.)

(a) Egyptian.

*Αβυδος 278. *Αθριβις 39. Αἴγυπτος 224; 1381. 237. Ἀλεξάνδρεια 1357. 2. *Απις 44. [Ἀφροδίτης] πόλις 1. Ἀφροδίτης πόλις τοῦ Προσω- πίτου 7. Βούβαστος 37. Βουκολεῖς 42. Βούσιρις 51, 269. Βουσιρίτης (νομός) 50. Βουτώ 27. Γυναικοπολίτης (νομός) 21. Δέλτα 10. Διὸς πόλις ἢ μικρά 36. *Εκρηγμα 75. Ἐρμού πόλις (α) 18 (?); (β) 35. Ἐρμού πόλις τοῦ Μενδησίου 52. Εσ[25. Ἡλίου πόλις 38; 1381. 19. Ἡρακλείον 61. Ἡρακλέους πόλις 150. Ἡρακλέους πόλις τοῦ Σεθροῖτου 56.	Ἡφαίστου οἶκος 2. H[. .]κτος 148. Θῶνις 28. Ἱερά Φθεμφθούτου 40. Ἱέρασος 13. Ἱ[σείον] 33. Ἱσίδιον τοῦ Σεθροῖτου 54. Καινὴ 31. Καλάμισις 11. Κάνωβος 62. Καρήνη 11. Κάσιον 75. Καταβαθμός 43. Κε . . κύλημις 17. [Κυνὸς] πόλις τοῦ Βουσιρίτου 49. Λεόντω(ν) πόλις 58. Λευκὴ Ἀκτὴ 45. [Λητ]οῦς πόλις 4. Μελαῖς 70. Μέμφις 249; 1381. 21. Μενδήσιος (νομός) 52. Μεν[ί]ουσις 64. Μένουθις 63. Μένουφις 71. Μερκούριον 1382. 19.	Μερμέρθα p. 44. Μετηλίτης (νομός) 72. Μονίμου (ἐποίκιον) p. 44. Μύλων 16. Μώμέμφις 14. M[. .]νέστιον 66. Ναύκρατις 19. Νεῖλος 125, 225. Νηβεο[31. Νήσος 68. Νιθίνη 21. Ξοῖς 42. Ἵοσίριδος ἄδyton 162. Πευκεστίς 69. Πέφρημις 22. Πηλούσιον 74. Πλιωθίνη 73. Προσωπίτης (νομός) 8. Σαῖς 32. Σαίτης (νομός) 30. Σεβέννυτος 33. Σεθροῖτης (νομός) 54, 56. Σχεδία 60. Τάνις 59.
---	---	---

Ταπόσιρις 67.
 Τέουχis 41.
 Φαγρωρίων (Φραγουρων Papy.)
 πόλις 46.
 Φάρβαιθος 53.

Φαρίτης 1382. 15, 17.
 Φέρνουφis 57.
 Φθεμφθούτης (νομός) 40.

Χάραξ 72.

Χνου[24.
 Χοατίνη 47.
 Ψώχημις 15.
]οφis 4.

(b) *Non-Egyptian.*

Ἀμαζόνες 102.
 Ἀραβία 77.
 Ἀσία 90.
 Ἀσκάλων 96. Ἀσκαλωνίτης
 οἶνος 1384. 32.

Βαμβύκη 100.
 Βηρυτός 116.
 Βιθυνία 112.

Γάγγης 226.
 Γάζα 99.

Δελφοί 99.
 Δῆλος 101.
 Δίνδυμα 114.
 Δῶρα 94.

Ἐλεύθερος 225.
 Ἑλλάς 95.
 Ἑλλην 1381. 201.
 Ἑλληνίς 1381. 34, 198.
 Ἑλλησποντος 110.
 Ἐρυθρὰ θάλασσα 118.

Θεσσαλοί 103.
 Θράκες 101.

Ἰνδική 226.
 Ἰνδοί 103.
 Ἰταλία 109.

Καρία 113.
 Κνίδος 80.
 Κρήτη 82.
 Κυκλάδες νῆσοι 84.
 Κύπρος 88.
 Κυρήνη 81.

Λατίνος 104.
 Λυκία 78, 79.

Μάγοι (Ματοι Papy.) 105.
 Μύνδος 111.
 Μύρα τῆς Λυκίας 79.

[Nῆ]σος 77.

Πάτμος (Παθμος Papy.) 85.
 Πάφος 86.
 Πέργαμος 108.
 Πέρσαι 104.
 Πέτρα 91.
 Πιερία 90.
 Πόντος 108.
 Πτολεμαίς 117.

Ῥαφέα 97.
 Ῥινοκόλουρα (-ρουλα Papy.) 93.
 Ῥόδιοι ἄνεμοι 1383. 6, 11.
 Ῥώμη 83.

Σαλαμίς 87.
 Σαμοθράκη 107.
 Σάμος 110.
 Σιδών 116.
 Σινώπη 96.
 Σοῦσα 105.
 Σοῦσα τῆς κατὰ τὴν Ἐρυθρὰν
 θάλασσαν 118.
 Στράτωνος Πύργος 94.

Τένεδος 112.
 Τρίπολις 98, 225.
 Τρωάς 114.

Υψήλη 92.

Φοινίκη (Φοινιξ Papy.) Συρίας
 106.

Χαλκηδών 82.
 Χαλκιδική 89.
 Χίος 87.

IV. RELIGION.

(a) GRAECO-EGYPTIAN.

(1) *Titles of Isis* (all from 1380).

ἀβίβαστος 115.
 ἀγαθή 51, 59, 95.
 ἀγάπ[η 28. ἀγ. θεῶν 109.
 ἀγία 34, 36, 89.
 ἀγνή 86.

ἀγω[29.
 ἀθάνατος 13.
 Ἀθήνη 30, 72.
 ἀλήθεια 63.
 ἀμίαντος 109.

ἄνασσα 15, 16, 23, 32, 37.
 ἄν. πόλεων 57. ἄν. τῆς οἰκου-
 μένης 121.
 ἀνδρoσώτειρα (ανδρασ. Papy.)
 55.

- ἄνω, τὸ ἄ. 38, 42.
 ἀπάτειρα 19.
 ἀρίστη 99.
 Ἄρποκράτης, τῶν θεῶν Ἄ. 136.
 Ἄρτεμις 84.
 ἄσπίς 58.
 Ἀστάρτη 116.
 Ἀταργάτη 100.
 ἄφεισις ἐφόδων 80.
 Ἀφροδίτη 9, 22, 35, 38, 45, 67.
 βασιλίσις 36.
 βόστρυχος, ἐν ταῖς πανηγύρεσι β. 133.
 Βούβαστις 4.
 γραμματική 48, 123.
 γυπόμορφος 66.
 δεσποτὶς 108. δεσπ. πάντων 23.
 δία 26, 86, 111.
 διάδημα ζῶης 139.
 Δικτυννίς 82.
 δότεира 13, 68.
 δυνάστις 34, 41, 57, 97.
 Ἐκάτη 108.
 Ἐλένη 112.
 ἐλευθερία 80.
 Ἑλλάς 95.
 ἐπανάγουσα τὸν Νεῖλον 126.
 ἐπίνοια 34, 60.
 ἐπίτροπος 121.
 Ἑσερέμφις 46.
 Ἑστία 23, 73.
 εὐθηρία, τῶν τὰς καλὰς ἀγόντων ἡμέρας εὐθ. 135.
 εὐπλία 99.
 εὐπορία 132.
 εὐρέτρια 81. εὐρ. πάντων 185.
 εὐφροσύνη 19, 31.
 ζῶον, θεῶν πάντων τὸ καλὸν ζ. 127.
 ἡγεμονίς 52. ἡγ. διαδημάτων 193.
 ἡλίου ὄνομα 112.
 ἡπία 11, 86.
 Ἡρα 26, 32, 34, 60, 68.
 Θανῆστις 68.
 Θαψ[ε]ῦσις 105.
 θεά, ἐν Ὀλύμπῳ θ. εὐπρεπῆς 130.
 Θέμις 83.
 θεός 77, 107. μεγίστη θεῶν 142.
 ἱερά 18, 41, 110.
 ἱεροτικοτελοῦσα 78.
 ἱλαρὰ ὄψις, ἐν Δήθῃ ἱλ. ὄ. 127.
 Ἰσις 23, 33 (?), 76, 81, 115.
 Ἰώ, Ἰοῦς . . . προκαθημένη 64.
 Ἰὼ Σῶθις 143.
 καλλιμόρφος 18, 53.
 καλλίστη 100.
 κατόπτις 87.
 κεδνή 79.
 Κόρη 72, 105.
 κόσμος θηλειῶν 131.
 κρατίστη 96.
 κυβερνήτις 69.
 κυρία 62, 142. κ. ἀξήσεως καὶ φθορᾶς καὶ . . . 195. κ. τῆς γῆς 222. κ. θαλασσιῶν καὶ ποταμιῶν στομάτων 123. κ. στρατείας καὶ ἡγεμονίας 240. κ. φωτὸς καὶ φλεγμάτων 248. κ. πάσης χώρας 24.
 Λατίνα 104.
 Λητώ 79.
 λογιστική 27, 124.
 λωτοφόρος 40.
 Μαῖα 39, 42, 103, 116.
 μεγάλη 77.
 μεγίστη 21, 66 (?), 92. μεγ. θεῶν 142.
 μία 6.
 μισεχθὴς 137.
 μουσαναγωγός 62, 128.
 Μοῦχις (?) 45.
 μύστις 111.
 μ. [.]ιβ[.]κή 85.
 Ναναῖα (Nania Pap.) 106.
 νέα 85.
 νικήτρια 30, 48.
 νύμφη 30.
 ὀδηγός 122.
 Ὀνε[] 1.
 ὀρθωσία 39, 98.
 ὄνομα ἡλίου 112. πρῶτον ὄ. 143.
 ὀρμίστρια 15, 74.
 Παλέντρα (?) 115.
 πανάφθονος 88.
 πάνταρχος, ἐν ταῖς τῶν θεῶν ἐξοδίαις π. 137.
 παντοκράτειρα 20.
 παντόπ[]τις 93.
 πιστοῖασις ἀνέμου 138.
 πολύμορφος 9, 70.
 πολυόφθαλμος 129.
 πολυώνυμος 97, 101.
 Πραξιδική 50.
 προκαθημένη, Ἰοῦς . . . πρ. 64.
 πρόνοια 43.
 πρῶτον ὄνομα 143.
 Σαρκοῦνις 119.
 σελήνη 104.
 στείχουσα 87.
 στολαρχίς 8.
 στρατία 71, 83, 102.
 σώζουσα 76.
 Σῶθις, Ἰοῖ Σῶθι 144.
 σώτειρα 20, 91, 293.
 ταυρῶπις 107.
 Ταχνηψις 75.
 ταχυνίκης 69.
 τελεία 32.
 τριοδίτις 91.
 τριφυής 84.
 τύχη 51.
 Τ[.]β[.]α 114.
 φιλία 94.
 φιλόστοργος 12, 131.
 φρόνησις 44.
 φρονίμη 117, 124.
 χαριτόμορφος 59.

χρησμοφδός 43.

ώραία 90.

]αθροίχης 14.

]ιον 7.

]λε . εθεῦς 282.

]οιωεανεῦς 296.

]τααβδεῦς 286.

]τη 17.

]φίς 47.

]χμειῦς 3.

(2) *Other Gods.*

Ἄπολλων 1380. 210; 1381. 232.

Ἀσκληπίος 1381. 26, 189, 228, 246. δεσπότης 1381. 181. διδάσκαλος 1381. 189. ὁ θεός = Ἄ. 1381. 51, 71, 116, 131, 143, 207, 217. μέγιστος θεῶν 1381. 188.

Διόσκουροι 1380. 235.

Ἐρμῆς 1381. 230.

Ζεὺς Σάραπις 1382. 20. Ζ.

ἥλιος μέγας Σάρ. 1382. 22.

ἥλιος. See Ζεὺς.

Ἡφαιστος 1380. 2; 1381. 229.

θεός. See Ἀσκληπίος. θεοὶ 1380. 109, 126, 135, 136, 140, 143, 159, 181, 263; 1381. 188.

Ἴμούθης 1381. 202.

Καλειόβις 1381. 231.

Ὄσιρις 1380. 162, 198. μέγας

Ὄσ. 1380. 242.

Σάραπις. See Ζεὺς.

Φθᾶ 1381. 201.

Ῥωρος 1380. 222, 233, 234, 246, 250; 1381. 230. Ῥρ.

Ἄπολλων 1380. 210.

(3) *Miscellaneous.*

ἀγαθὸς δαίμων 1380. 189.

ἀγνείαι (Ἀσκληπίου) 1381. 148.

ἄδυτον 1380. 216. Ὄσίριδος ἄδ. See Index III (a). ἐν Μέμφει ἄδ. 1380. 269.

ἀρετή 1381. 47, 136; 1382. 19, 23.

βίβλος 1381. 9, 25, 29, 33, 162, 172, 185, 227.

δαίμονες 1380. 164.

εἰκόνας θεῶν 1380. 139.

εἰς Ζεὺς Σάραπις 1382. 20.

ἐξοδαὶ θεῶν 1380. 137.

ζῶον, ζῶον θεῶν 1380. 127, 140. ἱερὰ ζῶα 1380. 161.

ἱερεῦς 1381. 18, 149.

ἱερόν 1380. 278; 1381. 4.

ἰ. ἐν Βουσίρει τὸ καλούμενον

Β[1380. 270.

ἱερός, ἰ. ζῶα 1380. 161.

Ἰσεία 1380. 202.

καλαὶ ἡμέραι 1380. 134.

Λήθη 1380. 127.

Μενχόρης 1381. 30. Μενεχέρης 1381. 223.

Νεκτενίβις 1381. 1.

Ὀλυμπος 1380. 133.

παηγύρεις 1380. 133, 181.

προπομπεῖν 1381. 19.

προσπολεῖν 1381. 149.

προφητεία 1381. 23.

σύνοδοι 1380. 132.

Συρίων κυβερνήτης 1382. 23.

(b) CHRISTIAN.

(1) *Churches of Oxyrhynchus (all from 1357).*

Ἄννιανῆς 21, 44.

βαπτιστής 47.

ἅγιος Βίκτωρ 20.

τὸ β[ορρινὸν μαρτύριον 50.

ἅγ. Γαβριήλ 54.

εὐαγγελιστής 7, 23, 42.

ἅγια Εὐφημία 41, 51.

ἅγ. Ζαχαρίας 52.

ἅμα [Ἡραΐδος 40.

ἅγ. Θεόδ[οτος 63.

ἅγ. Θε[όδωρος 65.

ἅγ. Ἰερημίας 46.

ἅγ. Ἰουλιανός 48.

ἅγ. Ἰουστός 10, 13.

ἅγ. Κοσμᾶς 22.

ἅγ. Μαρία 30, 45, 68.

μαρτύρων 5.

ἅγ. Μηνᾶς 11.

ἅγ. Μιχαήλ 8, 39.

ἅγ. ἅπα Νούπ 56.

νοτινὴ ἐκ[κλησία 37, 61.

ἅγ. [Παῦλος 34.

ἅγ. Πέτρος 33.

ἅγ. Σεργῆνος 4, 28, 53.

ἅγ. Φιλόξενος 24, 38, 58, 64.

Φοιβάμμωνος 3, 6, 35, 36, 43, 57.

ἀββ[ᾶ . . . 49.

ἄγιος . . . 59.

(2) *Festivals and other Days* (all from 1357).

γέννα τοῦ Χριστοῦ 30. [ἐπιφάνεια τοῦ Χριστοῦ] 36. ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ (= Γαβριήλ) 54. (= Ἰουλιανῶ?) 48. (= Ἰού- στου) 10. (= Θεοδότου?) 63. (= Θεοδώρου?) 65.	(= Μηνᾶ) 11. (= Μιχαήλ) 8. (= Παύλου) 34. (= Πέ- τρου) 33. (= Φιλοξένου) 24. (= ἀββᾶ . . .) 49. ἡμ. αὐτῆς (= ἅμα Ἑραΐδος?) 40. (= Μαρίας) 45. ἡμ. Ἐπι-	μάχου 6. ἡμ. Ἰσίου 22. ἡμ. Κολλούθου (?) 66. ἡμ. μετα- νοίας 4. ἡμ. Φιλοθέου (?) 43. κυριακή 3, 5, 7, 21, 23, 28, 35, 44, 46, 52, 57, 60, 62, 67.
--	---	--

(3) *Miscellaneous.*

ἄγγελοι κυρίου 1384. 23. ἄγιος, ἁγία. See Index IV (δ). 1. ἄγιον πνεῦμα 1384. 21. βαπτιστής 1357. 47. ἐκ[κλησία] 1357. 61; cf. 37. εὐαγγελιστής 1357. 7, 23, 42.	ἀββᾶ 1357. 49. ἅμα 1357. 40. ἅπα 1357. 56. Ἰαὼ Σαβαώθ 1384. 28. Ἰησοῦς 1384. 17. κύριος 1384. 16 (?), 23, 26. μάρτυρες 1357. 5.	μαρτύριον 1357. 50 (?). οὐρανός 1384. 24. πάπας 1357. 2. πατήρ 1384. 21. σύναξις 1357. 1. υἱός 1384. 22. Χριστός 1357. 30, 36 (?).
--	---	--

V. GENERAL INDEX OF GREEK WORDS.

ἀββᾶ 1357. 49. ἀβίβαστος 1380. 115. ἀβουλία 1380. 258. ἀγαθός 1380. 51, 59, 95, 247; 1381. 204, 213. ἁγ. δαίμων 1380. 189. ἀγανακτεῖν 1381. 46. ἀγάπη 1380. 28, 109. ἀγασθαι 1381. 16. ἄγγελος 1384. 23. ἄγειν 1380. 134, 224. ἄγιος 1380. 34, 36, 89; and see Index IV (δ). 1. ἀγνεία 1381. 148. ἀγνός 1380. 86; 1384. 27. ἀγω[] 1380. 29. ἀδελφός 1380. 186. ἄδυτον 1380. 162, 216, 249. ἄθάνατος 1380. 13, 243; 1381. 46, 51, 196. [ἄ]θεός 1381. 68. ἄθλον 1381. 167. ἄθύρ 1357. 6. αἰδώς 1381. 44. αἰρεῖν 1381. 39. αἰφνίδιος 1381. 80. αἰών 1380. 292; 1381. 35.	αἰώνιος 1381. 225. ἀκάματος 1380. 160. ἄκεσις 1381. 72. ἀκεσώδυνος 1381. 143. ἀκίνητος 1381. 110. ἄκινος 1384. 31. ἀκμάζειν 1381. 194. ἀκόπως 1381. 114. ἀκοίειν 1381. 1, 29. ἀκριβώς 1381. 111. ἀλγεῖν 1381. 93. ἀλγηδών 1381. 142. ἄλγημα 1381. 81. ἀλήθεια 1380. 63; 1381. 173. ἀλλά 1381. 24 (οὐ μὴν ἄ.), 40, 44, 156, 183. ἀλλαττόλογος 1381. 180. ἄλλος 1380. 161; 1381. 26. ἄλς 1383. 8; 1384. 13. ἅμα 1357. 40. ἀμελεῖν 1381. 161. ἀμέτρητος, τὸ ἄμ. 1380. 145. ἀμίαντος 1380. 109. ἀμφιένυσθαι 1381. 119. ἀναβάλλεσθαι 1381. 59. ἀνάγειν 1381. 98. ἀναγιγνώσκειν 1381. 15.	ἀναγραφὴ 1381. 5. ἀναζητεῖν 1381. 11. ἀνάθημα 1381. 152, 191. ἀναλίσκειν 1381. 14, 244. ἀνανέωσις 1381. 25. ἀνανήφειν 1381. 125. ἀναπλεῖν 1382. 16. ἀναπλοῦν 1381. 173. ἀνασσα 1380. 15, 16, 23, 32, 37, 57, 121. ἀνατολή 1380. 157, 159. ἀνάφορον 1380. 260 (?). ἀνδρσώτετρα (ανδρασ. Pap.) 1380. 55. ἄνεμος 1380. 138, 237; 1383. 6, 9, 11. ἀνέρχεσθαι 1384. 23, 26, 28. ἀνηβάσκειν 1381. 197. ἀνήρ 1380. 147, 215; 1381. 44, 201; 1384. 15. ἀνθρώπινος 1381. 83. ἀνθρωπος 1380. 208; 1381. 118. ἀντάποινα 1381. 234. ἀντί 1381. 13. ἄνω, τὸ ἄ. 1380. 38, 42. ἅπα 1357. 56.
--	---	---

ἀπαγγέλλειν 1381. 91, 137, 219.
 ἀπαιτεῖν 1381. 148.
 ἀπαλλάσσειν 1381. 76, 128, 208.
 ἀπαντᾶν 1384. 15.
 ἄπαξ 1381. 161, 181.
 ἄπας 1380. 148, 171, 177, 185, 202, 206, 213, 268; 1381. 190.
 ἀπάτειρα 1380. 19.
 ἀπανδᾶν 1381. 54.
 ἀπιέναι 1381. 204.
 ἀπό 1380. 157; 1381. 19, 97, 122.
 ἀποδεικνύναι 1380. 168; 1381. 88.
 ἀποδιδόναι 1381. 79; 1382. 17 (?); 1384. 18.
 ἀποκλείειν 1383. 9.
 ἀπολέμητος 1381. 236.
 ἀπομάσσειν 1381. 133.
 ἀπονέμειν 1381. 21.
 ἀποστατεῖν 1381. 3.
 ἀποτυγχάνειν 1381. 43.
 ἄρα 1383. 9.
 ἀργύριον 1382. 18.
 ἀρετή 1380. 153; 1381. 47, 136, 211; 1382. 19, 23.
 ἀρμόζειν 1381. 187.
 ἄρουρα 1381. 27.
 ἄρρωστος 1384. 17 (?).
 ἄρχεσθαι 1381. 34.
 ἀρχιδικαστεία 1381. 8.
 ἀσεβής 1380. 298; 1381. 205.
 ἄσθμα 1381. 96.
 ἀσκεῖν 1381. 31.
 ἀσπάζεσθαι 1382. 16.
 ἀσπίς 1380. 58.
 ἀστραπή 1380. 238.
 ἄστρον 1380. 159.
 ἀξιάκειν 1380. 183 (?), 237.
 αὔξησις 1380. 176, 194.
 αὐτίκα 1381. 53.
 αὐτός 1357. 8 *et saep.*; 1380. 250, 263; 1381. 5 *et saep.*; 1382. 16, 18; 1384. 18, 26. ὁ αὐτ. 1357. 9 *et saep.*; 1381. 32.
 αὐτοῦ 1381. 247.

ἀφαιρεῖν 1381. 177.
 ἀφανής 1381. 124.
 ἄφεσις 1380. 80.
 ἄφθονος 1381. 232, 238.
 ἀφώνητος (αἰφωνατος Pap.) 1380. 280.

βαπτιστής 1357. 47.
 βάσανος 1381. 105.
 βασιλεύς 1380. 266; 1381. 12, 15, 223.
 βασιλικὸς (γραμματεὺς) 1399. recto.
 βασιλισσα 1380. 36, 218.
 βάσκανος 1381. 205.
 βήξ 1381. 97.
 βιβλιοθήκη 1382. 20.
 βίβλος 1381. 9, 25, 29, 33, 121, 162, 172, 185, 227.
 βίος 1380. 171; 1381. 49; 1382. 5.
 βλέπειν 1381. 111.
 βοήθημα 1381. 76.
 βοηθός 1381. 83.
 βορρινός 1357. 50.
 βύστρυχος 1380. 133.
 βούλεσθαι 1381. 4.
 βούλευμα 1380. 241.
 βροντή 1380. 238.

γάρ 1381. 40 *et saep.*
 γε 1381. 52.
 γέννα 1357. 30.
 γῆ 1380. 170, 222, 230.
 γῆρας 1381. 59 (?).
 γίγνεσθαι 1380. 162, 164, 186, 247; 1381. 125.
 γλήχων 1384. 11.
 γλώσσα 1381. 34, 199.
 γνώσις 1357. 1.
 γραμματικός 1380. 48, 123.
 γραφή 1381. 36, 47, 159, 175, 187, 195.
 γυνή 1380. 146, 214.
 γυπόμορφος 1380. 66.

δαίμων 1380. 164. ἀγαθὸς δ. 1380. 189.
 δαφνόκοκκα 1384. 8.

δέ 1380. 175, 225-6, 246; 1381. 10 *et saep.*
 δεικνύναι 1380. 207 (?); 1381. 190.
 δεῖσθαι 1381. 72 (?).
 δεκάπεντε θεσμοί 1380. 119.
 δεξιός 1381. 81.
 δέος 1381. 113.
 δεσπότης 1381. 162, 181.
 δεσπότης 1380. 108, 231.
 δεῦρο 1381. 203.
 διά 1380. 227; 1381. 29, 74, 78, 138, 139, 148, 226 (?), 237; 1382. 15.
 διάδημα 1380. 139, 194.
 διάδοχος 1380. 251, 263.
 διακαθαίρειν 1380. 177.
 διαλαλεῖν 1381. 135.
 διανοιγνύναι 1381. 110.
 διαπορεῖν 1381. 157.
 διαφθεῖρειν 1380. 241.
 διαφοιτᾶν 1381. 216.
 διδάσκαλος 1381. 189.
 δίδοναι 1380. 175-6; 1381. 143; 1383. 10.
 διέπειν 1381. 7.
 διηγείσθαι 1381. 42.
 διήγημα 1381. 177.
 δῖος 1380. 26, 86, 111.
 διότι 1381. 39.
 δῖς 1381. 123.
 δόξα 1381. 226.
 δότειρα 1380. 13, 68.
 δραχμή p. 44; 1382. 18; 1384. 2-12.
 δρόσος 1380. 173, 229.
 δύναμις 1380. 215; 1381. 42, 90, 146, 217, 220.
 δυνατός 1384. 29.
 δύο 1381. 13. δύο προστάγματα 1380. 156.
 δύσις 1380. 158.
 δυσσεβεῖν 1381. 243.
 δωρεά 1381. 192.
 δωρεῖσθαι 1381. 233.
 δώρημα 1381. 222.
 ἔγγονος 1381. 22.
 ἐγείρειν 1381. 126.
 ἔγκερ . . ν 1380. 227.

- ἐγὼ 1381. 32 *et saep.*; 1383.
 7. ἡμεῖς 1381. 77, 145,
 151; 1384. 15.
 ἐθέλειν 1383. 7.
 ζῆνος 1380. 217.
 εἰ 1381. 52.
 εἰδέναι 1380. 207; 1381. 153.
 εἴκοσι 1381. 18.
 εἰκῶν 1380. 139.
 εἶναι 1380. 199, 221, 227;
 1381. 44, 92, 104, 109,
 117.
 εἶς 1380. 6; 1381. 10, 143;
 1382. 20.
 εἰς 1357. 3 *et saep.*; 1380.
 202, 268; 1381. 14, 20,
 31, 58, 86, 101, 215; 1382.
 18; 1384. 30, 34.
 εἰσαεὶ 1380. 231.
 εἰσιέναι 1381. 113.
 εἶτα 1381. 107; 1384. 33.
 εἶτε 1381. 115, 116.
 ἐκ (ἐξ) 1380. 139, 153, 184,
 269; 1381. 5.
 ἕκαστος 1381. 23.
 ἑκατόν 1382. 18.
 ἐκεῖ 1383. 8.
 ἐκεῖνος 1381. 243.
 ἐκκλησία 1357. 37, 61.
 ἐκτενέστερον 1381. 11.
 ἐκχεῖν 1384. 19 (?).
 ἐλαία 1384. 18.
 ἔλαιον 1384. 18.
 ἔλεος 1381. 86.
 ἐλευθερία 1380. 80.
 Ἑλληὴν ἀνήρ 1381. 201.
 Ἑλληνὶς γλῶσσα 1381. 34, 198.
 ἐμός 1381. 104, 183.
 ἐν 1357. 2; 1380. 1 *et saep.*;
 1381. 35, 36, 172, 174;
 1382. 19; 1384. 16.
 ἐναντίος 1381. 242.
 ἐνεῖναι (ἐν) 1384. 17.
 ἐνεργέστερον 1381. 87, 94.
 ἐνιαυτός 1380. 204.
 εὐκῶς 1381. 77.
 ἐξ 1381. 17.
 ἐξαπίνης 1381. 107.
 ἐξευμενίζειν 1381. 147.
 ἐξοδία 1380. 137.
 ἕξω 1381. 39.
 ἐπαληθίζειν 1381. 89.
 ἐπανάγειν 1380. 126, 187.
 ἐπαπολισθάνειν 1381. 130.
 ἐπαυξάνειν 1381. 213.
 ἐπαυξ[] 1380. 297.
 ἐπεὶ 1381. 64, 79, 160.
 ἐπείγεισθαι 1383. 9.
 ἐπέχειν 1381. 37.
 ἐπί 1380. 10, 40, 45, 60, 61,
 65, 72, 74, 75, 91, 125, 151,
 267, 269; 1381. 3, 16, 71,
 82, 102, 166, 242, 243.
 ἐπιγινώσκειν 1381. 161.
 ἐπικαλεῖσθαι 1380. 153; 1381.
 163.
 ἐπικεφάλαιον 1368. introd.
 ἐπικρίνειν 1381. 6.
 ἐπινεύειν 1381. 72.
 ἐπινοεῖν 1380. 145, 173.
 ἐπίνοια 1380. 34, 60; 1381.
 169.
 ἐπισκῆπτειν 1381. 67.
 ἐπισκοπεῖν 1381. 124.
 ἐπιστήμη 1381. 210.
 ἐπίτροπος 1380. 121.
 ἐπιφάνεια 1357. 36 (?).
 ἐπιφέρειν 1380. 158.
 ἐπιχώριος 1380. 161.
 ἔραυνα 1381. 9.
 ἔρημος 1384. 16.
 ἐρμηνεῖα 1381. 33.
 ἐρμηνεύειν 1380. 120.
 ἔτερος 1381. 172.
 ἔτι 1381. 66, 126, 142, 231.
 ἐτοιμότερος 1381. 51, 85.
 ἔτος p. 44.
 εὐαγγελιστής 1357. 7, 23.
 εὐαρόμστος 1380. 188.
 εὐβάτος 1383. 10.
 εὐδαιμονία 1381. 235.
 εὐδαίμων 1381. 50.
 εὐδιάλλακτος 1380. 155.
 εὐεργεσία 1381. 52, 88, 145.
 εὐεργέτημα 1381. 221.
 εὐεργέτης 1380. 246.
 εὐθηνεῖσθαι 1381. 238.
 εὐθηνία 1380. 135.
 εὐθύς 1380. 283.
 εὐκόπως 1380. 240.
 εὐμένεια 1381. 182.
 εὐμενής 1381. 204.
 εὐπλεος 1380. 99.
 εὐπορεῖν 1381. 241.
 εὐπορία 1380. 132.
 εὐπρεπής 1380. 130.
 εὐρετής 1381. 188.
 εὐρέτρια 1380. 81, 185.
 εὐρίσκειν 1380. 179; 1381.
 18, 127.
 εὐσεβεία 1381. 240.
 εὐσεβεῖν 1381. 225.
 εὐσεβής 1381. 53.
 εὐτελής 1381. 75.
 εὐτυ[]χεῖν 1381. 227.
 εὐφραίνεσθαι 1380. 159.
 εὐφροσύνη 1380. 19, 31, 178.
 εὐχή 1380. 182 (?).
 εὐώνυμος 1381. 120.
 ἐφικτός 1381. 41.
 ἔφοδος 1380. 80.
 ἐφορμή 1381. 63.
 ἔχειν 1380. 142, 239; 1381.
 222, 234.
 ἕως 1381. 123.
 ζεῖν 1384. 36.
 ζηλωτής 1381. 211.
 ζήτησις 1381. 15.
 ζφὴ 1380. 138.
 ζῶον 1380. 127, 140, 161;
 1381. 93.
 ἦ 1381. 118, 192.
 ἡγεμονία 1380. 240.
 ἡγεμονίς 1380. 52, 193.
 ἡδεσθαι 1381. 156.
 ἡδία 1380. 132.
 ἡλικία 1381. 61.
 ἥλιος 1380. 112, 157, 221,
 233. Ἥλιος 1382. 22.
 ἡμέρα 1380. 135, 154, 178;
 1381. 13; and see Index
 IV (δ). 2.
 ἦπιος 1380. 11, 86, 155.
 θάλασσα 1380. 118, 230;
 1381. 214.
 θαλάσσιος 1380. 122.
 θάπτειν 1380. 189.

θάσσον 1381. 6.
 θεά 1380. 130.
 θεήλατος 1381. 167.
 θεῖος 1381. 17, 94, 112, 159, 162.
 θεϊότης 1381. 165, 186.
 θέλειν 1380. 148, 175.
 θεός. See Index IV (a). 1 and 2.
 θεραπεία (θαραπια Pap.) 1384. 17, 34.
 θεράπων 1381. 116.
 θερμός 1384. 33.
 θεσμός 1380. 120.
 θήλυς 1380. 131.
 θητεύειν 1381. 206.
 θνητός 1381. 41.
 θρήσκια 1380. 245.
 θροιστής 1380. 251.
 θρόνος 1380. 265.
 θύειν 1380. 149.
 θύρα 1380. 279.
 θυσία 1381. 78, 147, 151, 192.

 ἴασθαι 1384. 30.
 ἴασις 1384. 27.
 ἰατρεία 1381. 144.
 ἰατρική 1381. 55, 209.
 Ἰαὼ Σαβαώθ 1384. 28.
 ἴδιος 1381. 87.
 ἰδρυμ[1380. 294.
 ἰδρώς 1381. 129.
 ἱερεύς 1381. 18, 149.
 ἱερόν 1380. 270, 278; 1381. 4.
 ἱερονικοτελεῖν 1380. 78.
 ἱερός 1380. 18, 41, 110, 161.
 ἱκετεύειν 1381. 154.
 ἱκέτης 1381. 70.
 ἱλαρός 1380. 127, 162.
 ἰνδικτίων ιδ 1357. 2.
 Ἰσεῖον 1380. 202.
 ἴσος 1380. 215.
 ἱστορία 1381. 17, 38, 166, 200.
 ἰσχυρός 1384. 29.

 καθαπλοῦν 1381. 168.
 καθάρσιος 1384. 1.
 καθέζεσθαι 1381. 105.
 καθιστάναι 1380. 203, 214, 267.

καὶ γάρ 1381. 103, 170.
 καιρός 1381. 58, 194, 197.
 κακόν 1381. 244.
 καλεῖν 1380. 5, 270.
 καλλίμορφος 1380. 18, 53.
 καλός 1380. 127, 134. κάλ-
 λιστος 1380. 100. καλῶς
 1380. 188.
 κάμνειν 1381. 66.
 καρηβαρεῖν 1381. 99.
 καρπός 1381. 238.
 κάρυον 1384. 9.
 κατά 1380. 152, 153, 206;
 1381. 81, 106, 118, 146,
 182, 183, 196.
 καταγγέλλειν 1381. 150.
 κατάγειν 1380. 255.
 καταδεικνύναι 1380. 178.
 καταξάνειν 1380. 257.
 καταφθείρειν 1380. 176.
 καταχωρίζειν 1382. 19.
 κατέρχεσθαι 1357. 1.
 κατέχειν 1381. 56.
 κατιέναι 1381. 45.
 κατοπτεύειν 1381. 114.
 κατόπτis 1380. 87.
 κεδνός 1380. 79.
 κεύειν 1380. 259; 1383. 6.
 κεφαλή 1381. 122.
 κηδεία 1381. 224.
 κηρύσσειν 1381. 35, 144.
 κίνδυνος 1381. 214.
 κλύζεσθαι 1384. 36.
 κοιμᾶσθαι 1381. 92.
 κομίζειν 1381. 12.
 κόριον 1384. 7.
 κοσμοποιία 1381. 170.
 κόσμος 1380. 130, 211.
 κόστος 1384. 5.
 κρατεῖν 1380. 144; 1384. 25.
 κράτιστος 1380. 96.
 κράτος 1380. 239, 257.
 κτίζειν 1380. 64, 151, 280,
 284.
 κυβερνᾶν 1380. 187.
 κυβερνήτης 1382. 24.
 κυβερνήτης 1380. 69.
 κύμινον 1384. 2.
 κυπάρισσος 1384. 35.
 κυριακή 1357. 3 *et saep.*

κύριος 1380. 24, 62, 123,
 142, 196, 210, 218, 222,
 240, 248, 265; 1384.
 16 (?), 23, 26; 1399.
 recto.
 κωλύειν 1381. 45, 115.

 λαλεῖν 1381. 179, 199.
 λαμβάνειν 1381. 226; 1382.
 17; 1384. 27, 31, 35.
 λαμπρός 1381. 119.
 λέγειν 1383. 8; 1384. 18,
 26. εἰπεῖν 1381. 156;
 1382. 15, 20; 1384. 16(?).
 λήθαργος (αληθ. Pap.) 1381.
 100.
 Λήθη 1380. 127.
 λήμμα p. 44.
 λογιστικός 1380. 27, 124.
 λόγος 1381. 174.
 λωτοφόρος 1380. 40.
 λωφᾶν 1381. 141.
 λ[.]σις 1380. 231.

 μακρολογεῖσθαι 1381. 178.
 μάλιστα 1381. 10, 28, 60.
 μανθάνειν 1381. 35.
 μάραθον 1384. 3.
 μαρτύριον 1357. 50 (?).
 μάρτυς 1357. 5.
 μαστίχη 1384. 6.
 μέγας 1380. 77, 242; 1382.
 22. μέγιστος 1380. 21,
 66, 92, 142, 188.
 μέγεθος 1381. 31, 38, 221.
 μέλλειν 1381. 39, 89, 195,
 218.
 μέν 1381. 3, 16, 50, 111,
 118, 128, 131, 175.
 μένειν 1383. 7.
 μέρος 1383. 6, 8.
 μέσος 1381. 36; 1384. 23 (?).
 μετά 1357. 1; 1381. 80, 112.
 μεταλαμβάνειν 1381. 107.
 μετάνοια 1357. 4.
 μεταχειρίζεσθαι 1381. 209.
 μετέωρος, τὸ μετ. 1380. 144.
 Μεχείρ 1357. 48.
 μέχρι 1380. 158.
 μή 1383. 8.

- μηδέ 1381. 106, 151.
 μηδεῖς 1381. 66.
 μῆλον 1384. 35.
 μήν (subst.) 1381. 9.
 μήν, οὐ μὴν ἀλλά 1381. 24.
 μηνύειν 1381. 136.
 μήτε 1381. 152.
 μήτηρ 1381. 67, 71, 102.
 μικρός. See Διὸς πόλις.
 μισεχθής 1380. 137.
 μνήμη 1381. 198.
 μόλις 1381. 70, 158.
 μόνος 1380. 181; 1381. 40,
 193. μόνον 1381. 14, 43,
 53, 122.
 μουσαναγωγός 1380. 62, 128.
 μῦθος 1381. 172, 180.
 μύστις 1380. 111.

 ναυσιβάτης 1383. 9.
 νέος 1380. 85, 211 (?).
 νεότης 1381. 63.
 νηφαλιώτερος 1381. 133.
 νικήτρια 1380. 30, 48.
 νοεῖν 1381. 70.
 νόμιμος 1380. 204.
 νόστος 1381. 56, 73, 207.
 νοτινός 1357. 37, 61.
 νύμφη 1380. 30.
 νύξ 1381. 91; 1383. 10.

 ξηρός 1380. 184; 1384. 31.

 ὄδε 1381. 141.
 ὄδηγός 1380. 122.
 ὀδύνη 1381. 98.
 ὄθεν 1381. 57, 181.
 ὀθόνη 1381. 120.
 οἶα 1381. 73.
 οἶεσθαι 1381. 168.
 οἶκος 1380. 2, 268.
 οἰκουμένη 1380. 121.
 οἶνος 1380. 180; 1384. 32.
 ὀλίγος 1381. 106.
 ὄλος 1380. 158; 1381. 174;
 1383. 9.
 ὄλυμπος 1380. 130.
 ὄμβρος 1380. 228.
 ὁμοίως 1357. 27, 32, 34, 50,
 59; 1380. 246.

 ὄμως 1381. 153.
 ὄναρ 1381. 108.
 ὄνειρον 1381. 74, 139.
 ὄνομα 1380. 113, 141, 143;
 1384. 20 (?).
 ὀνομάζειν 1380. 163.
 ὄξος 1384. 14.
 ὄρᾶν 1380. 152; 1381. 108,
 139.
 ὀρέγειν 1381. 64.
 ὀρθώσιος 1380. 39, 98.
 ὀρμᾶν 1381. 84, 166.
 ὀρμίστρια 1380. 15, 74.
 ὄς 1380. 64, 119, 139, 175,
 184, 221, 227, 260; 1381.
 89, 122, 242, 245.
 ὄσος 1381. 138, 206, 208,
 210, 212, 214.
 ὄταν 1380. 163.
 ὄτε 1381. 92; 1383. 7.
 ὄτι 1380. 208, 250; 1384.
 28.
 οὐ 1381. 40, 42, 155, 183.
 οὐκ 1381. 111. οὐ μὴν ἀλλά
 1381. 23.
 οὐλή 1384. 34.
 οὔτε 1381. 108.
 οὔτος 1381. 1, 80, 139, 154,
 155, 187, 237, 244. οὔτως
 1357. 2; 1381. 222.
 ὀφθαλμός 1381. 109; 1384.
 24.
 ὄψέ 1381. 69.
 ὄψις 1380. 128; 1381. 139.

 παγκάθαρος 1384. 27.
 παῖς 1381. 103, 229, 232.
 πάλαι 1381. 150.
 πάλιν 1381. 85, 145, 154.
 πανάφθονος 1380. 88.
 πανήγυρις 1380. 133, 181.
 πάνταρχος 1380. 137.
 πανταχῆ 1380. 172.
 παντῆ 1380. 210.
 παντοκράτειρα 1380. 20.
 παντόπ[τις] 1380. 93.
 πανύ 1381. 16.
 παπας 1357. 2.
 παρά 1382. 18.
 παραδιδόναι 1380. 204, 244.

 παρακελεύεσθαι 1381. 6.
 παραντίκα 1381. 193.
 παρῆναι 1381. 70; 1382. 20.
 παρέχειν 1380. 180.
 παροίχεσθαι 1381. 65.
 παροξύνειν 1381. 2.
 πᾶς 1380. 125 *et saep.*;
 1381. 73, 92, 137, 191,
 199, 200, 215.
 πατήρ 1384. 21.
 πάτριος 1380. 267.
 πείθειν 1384. 20.
 πειρᾶσθαι 1381. 127.
 πελάγιος 1383. 6, 8.
 πέλαγος 1383. 8.
 πέρνα 1384. 10.
 περί 1381. 247; 1382. 23.
 περισσεύειν 1381. 176.
 περισσός 1381. 61.
 περισώζειν 1381. 215.
 πηγῆ 1380. 228.
 πιθανολογεῖν 1381. 171.
 πίνειν 1384. 33.
 πιστοῖασπις 1380. 138.
 πιστός 1380. 152, 241.
 πλεῖν, πλείων 1383. 7.
 πλείων 1380. 234.
 πλευρά 1381. 141.
 πλευρόν 1381. 82, 98.
 πλήθος 1381. 5, 212, 235.
 πλήμμυρα 1380. 223.
 πλήν 1381. 93, 117.
 πληροῦν 1381. 164.
 πλουτίζειν 1381. 26.
 πνεῦμα 1383. 10; 1384. 21.
 ποιεῖν 1380. 215, 235, 243,
 250, 263, 291; 1381. 134.
 ποιείσθαι 1381. 10.
 πόλις 1380. 58, 202. Cf.
 Index III (a).
 πολλάκις 1381. 32, 54, 155.
 πόλος 1380. 232.
 πολύμορφος 1380. 9, 70.
 πολυόφθαλμος 1380. 129.
 πολύς 1381. 129, 212. πλείων
 1380. 234.
 πολώνυμος 1380. 97, 101.
 πονεῖν 1381. 211; 1384. 25,
 30.
 πόνος 1381. 100.

ποτάμιος 1380. 122.
 ποταμός 1380. 223.
 πον 1381. 178.
 πούς 1381. 123.
 πράκτωρ p. 44.
 πρέσβυς 1380. 148.
 προαιρείν 1380. 219. προ-
 αιρείσθαι 1381. 136.
 προθυμία 1381. 37, 54, 60.
 προϊστάναι 1381. 239.
 προκαθήσθαι 1380. 65.
 προκαθομολογείν 1381. 156.
 προκρίνειν 1380. 250.
 προλαμβάνειν 1381. 137.
 πρόνοια 1380. 43; 1381. 164.
 προπομπεύειν 1381. 19.
 πρὸς 1380. 201, 207; 1381.
 44, 52, 55, 73, 173; 1384.
 23.
 προσήκειν 1381. 22.
 προσκυνεῖν 1380. 142, 160;
 1381. 131.
 προσπληροῦν 1381. 175.
 προσπολεῖν 1381. 149.
 πρόσταγμα 1380. 156.
 προφητεία 1381. 23.
 προφητεύειν 1381. 169.
 πρῶτος 1380. 143, 181. πρῶ-
 τιστα 1380. 120.
 πτέρυξ 1380. 220.
 πυρετός 1381. 96, 128.
 πυροφόρος 1381. 27.
 ῥεῖν 1381. 82.
 ῥεύειν 1381. 36.
 ῥιψοκίνδυνος 1381. 57.
 σεβασμός 1381. 31.
 σέβεσθαι 1381. 202.
 σελήνη 1380. 104.
 σέλινον 1384. 4.
 σμύρνα 1384. 19.
 σός 1380. 165, 236(?); 1381.
 163, 165, 169, 182, 186,
 199.
 σπέρμα 1384. 31.
 σπόγγος 1384. 25.
 σπόριμος 1380. 170.
 σπουδάζειν 1381. 247.
 στείχειν 1380. 87.

στολαρχίς 1380. 8.
 στόμα 1380. 123.
 στραγγουρητία 1384. 30.
 στρατεία 1380. 239.
 στράτιος 1380. 71, 83, 102.
 στροβείν 1381. 69.
 σύ 1380. 141 *et saep.*; 1382.
 2, 15; 1384. 28.
 συμπληροῦν 1381. 48.
 σύναξις 1357. 1.
 συνιέναι 1381. 203, 206.
 συνιστάναι 1380. 154, 185.
 σύνοδος 1380. 132.
 συννορμίζειν 1380. 147.
 συντόμως 1381. 179.
 σφαδαίξειν 1381. 99.
 σφόδρα 1381. 2.
 σφοδρός 1381. 96.
 σώζειν 1380. 76; 1381. 57,
 78.
 σῶος 1380. 146.
 σῶτειρα 1380. 20, 91, 293.
 σωτήριος 1381. 218.
 ταπεινοῦν 1381. 158.
 ταπείνωμα 1381. 48 (?).
 ταυρῶπις 1380. 107.
 ταφή 1380. 196; 1381. 229.
 ταχνίκης 1380. 64.
 ταχύς 1381. 62, 82. θᾶσσον
 1381. 6.
 τε 1381. 97, 221, 222 (?).
 τεκμαίρεσθαι 1381. 185.
 τέλειος 1380. 32, 204.
 τελεσιουργεῖν 1381. 184.
 τέρας 1380. 277 (?).
 τερατώδης 1381. 219.
 τεταρταῖος 1381. 68.
 τηρεῖν 1381. 58.
 τίς 1384. 17, 26.
 τις 1381. 61, 117.
 τξε ἡμέραι 1380. 155.
 τοιοῦτος 1381. 186.
 τόπος 1380. 206; 1381. 216.
 τότε 1381. 8, 60, 236.
 τρεῖς 1380. 269; 1381. 224.
 τριάκοντα 1381. 13, 27.
 τριακόσιοι 1381. 27.
 τρίβειν 1384. 32.
 τριετής 1381. 65, 67.

τριοδίτις 1380. 91.
 τρίς 1381. 123.
 τριφυής 1380. 84.
 τρομώδης 1381. 126.
 τρόπος 1381. 245.
 τροφή 1380. 236.
 Τῦβι 1357. 33.
 τύπτειν 1383. 8.
 (τύραννος) 1380. 240.
 τύχη 1380. 51.
 ὑγρός 1380. 184.
 ὕδωρ 1382. 15, 17; 1383. 10.
 υἰός 1380. 209; 1384. 22.
 ὑπακούειν 1381. 86.
 ὑπεραλγεῖν 1381. 104.
 ὑπερμήκης 1381. 117.
 ὑπήκοος 1380. 164.
 ὑπιέναι 1381. 160.
 ὕπνος 1381. 101, 106, 108.
 ὑπό 1381. 30.
 ὑπομνηματισμός 1399. recto.
 ὑπόσχεσις 1381. 60, 151.
 ὑποτάσσειν 1381. 240; 1383.
 9.
 ὕστερος 1381. 175.
 ὑφαίνειν 1380. 146.
 ὑφιστάναι 1380. 221.
 φαίνειν 1381. 75. φαίνεσθαι
 1381. 95.
 Φαμενώθ 1357. 63.
 φαντασία 1381. 113.
 φαντασιούν 1381. 140.
 Φαῶφι 1357. 3.
 φέρειν 1381. 121. φέρεσθαι
 1380. 150; 1381. 101.
 φεύγειν 1381. 57.
 φήμη 1381. 50, 227 (?).
 φθάνειν 1381. 63.
 φθείρειν 1381. 194.
 φθορά 1380. 175, 195.
 φιλία 1380. 94.
 φιλόστοργος 1380. 12, 131;
 1381. 103.
 φλέγειν 1381. 96.
 φλέγμα 1380. 248.
 φοῦσκα 1384. 1.
 φράζειν 1381. 181.
 φρίκη 1381. 69.

- φρικτός 1381. 90.
 φρονεῖν 1381. 62.
 φρόνησις 1380. 44, 81, 183.
 φρόνιμος 1380. 117, 124.
 φύειν 1381. 62.
 φύλλον 1384. 12.
 φυσικός 1381. 173.
 φύσις 1381. 84, 103.
 φώς 1380. 248, 295.

 χαρίζεσθαι 1382. 15.

 χάρις 1380. 156; 1381. 79,
 191, 196.
 χαριτοδότηρα 1380. 10.
 χαριτόμορφος 1380. 59.
 χεῖρ 1381. 121.
 χιών 1380. 229, 239.
 χρᾶν 1381. 245.
 χρέος 1381. 160.
 χρεώστης 1381. 152.
 χρῆμα 1381. 233.
 χρησμάδος 1380. 43, 252,
 266.

 χρηστός 1381. 74.
 χρόνος 1380. 28, 203, 213,
 268; 1381. 65.
 χώρα 1380. 24, 125, 152,
 219, 234, 241.

 ψυχρός 1380. 184.

 ᾄ 1381. 203, 206.
 ᾠραῖος 1380. 90.
 ὤς 1381. 102, 155.
 ὠφελεῖν 1381. 49.

VI. SUBJECTS DISCUSSED IN THE INTRODUCTIONS AND NOTES.

(The numbers refer to pages.)

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p> accent in relation to metre
 236-7.
 Alcaeus, <i>στασιωτικά</i> 57.
 Alexander son of Amyntas
 66.
 All Saints' Day 31.
 Amazons 215.
 Andreas of Sicyon 105-6,
 108-9.
 Andronpolis 206.
 Anne, St. 36-7.
 Anniane 23-5.
 Anthesteria 88-9.
 Antiphon Sophistes, works
 92-3; style 95.
 Antisthenes 112.
 Aphroditopolis (two towns)
 203-4.
 Apis (town) 210.
 Apollo 223-4.
 Apostle. See Evangelist.
 Apostles, gospel of the XII
 239.
 Apuleius 190, 214, 225.
 Arabia 213.
 archidicastes 232.
 Archimachus (Archem.?) 115,
 119.
 aretology 225, 235.
 Aristides, rhetor 225, 233. </p> | <p> Aristophanes, order of plays
 134, 142, 146; papyri in
 relation to MSS. 134, 138;
 scholia 135, 136-8, 244.
 Aristotle on Sicyon 105-7;
 on Sicyonian Constitution
 105, 107-8.
 Asclepius. See Imhotep.
 Asia 214-15.
 Atarbechis 204.
 Atargatis 215.
 Athenaeus on Pollis 84, 88.
 Auge 52, 55.

 Bacchylides, fragments iden-
 tified 65, 81.
 Bambyce 215.
 book-form in papyri 6, 9,
 12, 121, 126, 134, 138,
 142, 145, 242-4, 246-7.
 Boreadae 46.
 Bubastis 203.
 Bucoli, Bucolia, Bucolic
 mouth 209.
 Busiris 210-11.
 Buto 207-8.
 Buzyges 115, 119.

 Caene 207.
 Caesarea in Palestine 215. </p> | <p> Calamisis (town) 204.
 calendar, early Christian 21.
 Julian and Egyptian 20.
 Caleoibis (deity) 223-4.
 Callimachus papyri 83; frag-
 ments identified 83, 88-91.
 Catabathmus 210.
 Cecrops 115.
 Charax (town) 213.
 Choerilus, works 245.
 Christmas 20, 28.
 churches at Oxyrhynchus
 23-6.
 Clisthenes of Sicyon 105-6.
 codex. See book-form.
 Coptic calendar in relation
 to Greek 35-43.
 Cosmas, St. 37.
 Croesus 12, 18.
 Cross, festivals of the 32.
 marginal cross 82.
 Cynopolis in the Delta 210.
 Cypselus 107-8.

 Delphi 215.
 Delta 204.
 Demonax 115.
 Demosthenes, number of his
 speeches 112; oldest frag-
 ment of D. 186. </p> |
|--|---|--|

- diadem 217.
 Diodorus on Sicyon 105-6.
 diplê 18.
 Dioscuri 220.
 Diospolis Parva (in the Delta) 208.
 dreams, Homer on *δημος* *ὄνειρον* 49-50.

 Easter, date of 20, 30, 42.
 Ebionites, gospel of the 238-9.
 Eleutherus, river 220.
 emendations verified. (1) Aristophanes: Bekker and Blaydes 142, 145; Bergk and Brunck 146, 153. (2) Callimachus: Bentley 89, 90-1; Nauck 89; H. Stephanus 89. (3) Euripides: Weil 127, 133. (4) Sophocles: Musgrave 125. (5) Thucydides: Aemilius Portus 177; Gertz 178; Herwerden 182; Hude 178.
 Ephorus 106-9.
 Epimachus, St. 25-7.
 Epiphany 29, 38.
 Eridanus 50-1.
 Erigone, festival of 88.
 Eseremphis (title of Isis) 210.
 Euphemia, St. 24, 38.
 Euripides MSS. in relation to papyri 127.
 Europa 45, 49.
 Evangelist, church of the 25-6.

 festivals at Oxyrhynchus 26-32.
 frontier of Egypt and Palestine 213.

 Gabriel, Archangel 29-30, 40.
 Ganges 220.
 Glaucetes, adventures of 119.
 Greek calendar in relation to Coptic 35-42.

 Gynaecopolite nome 206.
 Harpies 46.
 Hebrews, gospel according to the 239.
 Hecamede 243.
 Helen 216.
 Heliopolite nome 203.
 Hellas (title of Isis) 215.
Hellenica Oxyrhynchia, style and authorship 107.
 Hera 207.
 Heracleopolis 211.
 Heracleum 212.
 Heraclides Lembus 113-15.
 Heraïs, ama 23-5.
 Hermes 209, 221, 223-4.
 Hermippus 113.
 Hermopolis, (1) 205; (2) 208; (3) 211.
 Herodotus on Sicyon 105-6, 108-9.
 Hesiod papyri 44; fragments identified 49, 50.
 Hestia 206.
 Hieria (town) 209.
 Hieracion, St. 39.
 Hierasus 205.
 Hiero 66.
 Homer on *δημος* *ὄνειρον* 49-50; on Sarpedon 45, 49.
 Horus 209, 219-20, 223-4.
 Hypapante 29, 40.
 Hyperides, possible author of 1366. 112.
 Hypsele (town) 215.

 Iamblichus in relation to Antiphon 94-5.
 Icus 83, 88.
 Imhotep, worship of 221-3; tomb of 221, 223-4.
 India 216.
 Innocents' Day 29.
 Io 212.
 Iseum (town) 208.
 Isidium (town) 211.
 Ision 25, 27.
 Isis, titles 191-4, 203-20; worship in Egypt 194-5, 203-13, 218, 220; worship elsewhere 195, 213-16.
 Island (place-name) (1) 212; (2) 213.
 Italy 216.

 James, festival of St. 31.
 Jehovah Sabaoth 239.
 Jeremiah, St. 38-9.
 Jewish apocalyptic work 239.
 John, St. J. the Baptist 25-6, 39.
 John, St. J. the Evangelist, church of 25-6; festival of 31-2.
 Julianus, St. 29, 39.
 Justus, St. 24, 27-8, 36.

 Laodicea, Council of 30, 43.
 Lasus, fragment of 119.
 Latina (title of Isis) 215.
 law and nature contrasted 93-4.
 Lent 30, 41.
 Leontopolis 211.
 Leuce Acte 210.
 Libanius on Sicyon 105-6, 108.
 lotus 209.
 Lysias, possible author of 1366. 112.

 Manetho on Imhotep 221.
 Mantinea 115, 118.
 Martyrs, church of the 35.
 Mary, the Virgin 29, 31, 43.
 Melaïs 212-13.
 Memphis 195, 203.
 Menas, St. 27.
 Menelaïs 212-13.
 Menkaura (Mencheres) 221-3.
 Menouphis 213.
 Menouthis 212.
 Mercurium at Alexandria 236.
 Metelite nome 213.
 metre, accent and quantity in 236; three-line stanzas in Alcaeus 57.

VI. SUBJECTS DISCUSSED IN INTRODUCTIONS AND NOTES 275

- Michael, Archangel 27, 30, 35-6.
 Momemphis 205.
 moon 216.
 Mouchis 210.
 Myron of Sicyon 105-6, 108-9.
 Nanai, Babylonian goddess 216.
 Nativity 20, 28.
 nature and law contrasted 93-4.
 Naucratis 205-6.
 Nebeo[(town) 207.
 Nechautes, archidicastes 232.
 Nectanebo 222-3.
 New Testament cursive MSS. 1, 5, 6.
 Niciu 203-4.
 Nicolaüs Damascenus on Sicyon 105-7, 109.
 Nile 209, 217.
 Nithine 206.
 Northern *μαρτύριον* 23.
 Noup, St. apa 40-1.
 oracle in relation to chronology 105, 109.
 Orthagoras 105-6.
 Osiris 217-18, 220.
 Papnuthius, St. 41.
 Papremis 206.
 papyrus roll discovered in a temple 222-3.
 patriarch of Alexandria 21-2.
 Paul, St. 29, 37-8.
 Pausanias on Sicyon 105, 108.
 Peleus, festival of 84-5.
 Pelusium 213.
 Peter, St. 29, 37-8. Gospel of P. 238-9.
 Petra 214-15.
 Peucestis (town) 212.
 Phagroriopolis 210.
 Pherenicus, horse of Hiero 66.
 Phernouphis (town) 211.
 Philip, gospel of 238-9.
 Philochorus, fragment of 115.
 Philotheus, St. 38.
 Philoxenus, St. 27, 37.
 Phoebammon, St. 23-5, 32.
 Phthemphuthite nome 209.
 Plinthine 213.
 Plutarch on Sicyon 105, 109.
 Pollis 84-5, 88.
 Praxidice 211.
 Pronoia 210.
 Prosopite nome 204.
 Psochemis (town) 205.
 Ptolemaeus Pindarion 82.
 Pythagoras 114.
 Red Sea 216.
 repentance, day of 26.
 Rhinocolura 213, 215.
 Rome 214.
 Rufinus on Oxyrhynchus 26.
 saints with churches at Oxyrhynchus 24-7; saints' days 26-30.
 Samothrace 216.
 Sarpedon 45, 49.
 Saturday services 28, 30.
 Satyrus 114.
 scholia on Euripides, *Or.* 133; on Aristoph. *Clouds* 135-8.
 Serenus, St. 35.
 Sethroïte nome 211, 213.
 Severus 43.
 Sicyon, tyrants of 105-9.
 Sinope 215.
 snake, Isis as 211, 219.
 Socrates on synaxeis 19, 28.
 sophists 93-4.
 Sophocles MSS. in relation to papyri 122.
 Sothis 217.
 Sotion 114.
 Southern church 23, 38.
 stations 19, 22.
 Stephen, St. 28-9.
 stichometry 2; stichometrical numbering in prose works 103.
 Sunday services 20, 22, 30, 31.
 Susa on the Red Sea 216.
 synaxis 19, 22, 26, 28.
 Taposiris 212.
 Telephus 52-5.
 Teouchis (town) 209.
 Thapseusis (title of Isis) 216.
 Theodorus, St. 30, 42.
 Theodotus, St. 30, 42.
 Theogenes of Icus 83.
 Thonis 207.
 Thoth. See Hermes.
 Thucydides MSS. in relation to papyri 156-64.
 Timotheus IV, patriarch 21.
 titles of papyri 115, 235, 245.
 Trinity, order of Persons in the 238.
 triple-faced goddess 214.
 Tripolis 215.
 Tyre 216.
 uncanonical gospel 238-9.
 vellum fragments 1, 2, 5, 242, 244.
 verso, use of for literary texts 44, 190, 221, 245; patches for strengthening v. 113.
 Victor, St. 36.
 week-day services 28.
 wine 217-19.
 women, position of 217, 219.
 writing, discovery of 193, 224.
 Xoïs, Xoïte nome 209-10.
 Zachariah, St. 40.

VII. PASSAGES DISCUSSED.

(a) AUTHORS.

	PAGE		PAGE
Aeschylus Fr. 99 (Nauck)	45	Euripides, <i>I. T.</i> 1259 sqq.	50
Aesop 339	247	<i>Rhes.</i> 29	45
Agatharchides (<i>Geogr. Gr. min.</i> i. 180)	213	Geogr. Ravennas 204, 206, 209-10, 212	212
Anthologia Palat. vii. 2	88	Hebrews, gospel of the	239
Antiphon Soph. Fr. 44 (Diels)	92, 102	Helladius, <i>Chrest.</i>	88
58 "	103	Hermippus Fr. 50	208
Apollodorus iii. 4. 2	48	Hermogenes, <i>De ideis</i> ii. 11. 17	95
10. 3	56	Herodian, Π. μov. λξξ. 13	243
12. 1	55	23	233
Apuleius, <i>Metam.</i> xi. 5 190, 208, 210, 214		Herodotus i. 180	216
Aristotle, 'Αθ. πολ. 12. 5, 14. 1, 20. 1,		ii. 6	213
24. 3, 27. 4, 42. 7	111	17	209
Πολ. p. 1310 b	107	18	210
1315 b	105-6, 108-9	59	210
1316 a	105-6, 108-9	113-20	216
Athenaeus i. 32 b	89	129	223
ii. 39 e	80	141	204
iv. 137 e	89	156	207
iv. 154 d	118	163	206
ix. 372 a	89	iii. 12	206
Babrius 79	247	iv. 161	118
Bacchylides v	81	v. 104	109
Fr. 20	65-6, 80	vi. 126	105-6, 108-9
Fr. 34	81	Hesiod, <i>Theog.</i> 212	50
Callimachus Fr. 86	90	Fr. 30	45
98 c	91	Frs. 52-9	46
109	84, 88-9	Fr. 54	46
111	89	Fr. 55	46, 50
190	90	Fr. 57	51
372	85, 89	Fr. 60	49
508	89	Fr. 62	49, 50
Clemens Alex. <i>Strom.</i> i. 21	224	Fr. 65	51
Diodorus i. 14	218	Fr. 233	49
i. 25	204, 216, 220	Hierocles, <i>Synec.</i>	208, 210
i. 27	219	Homer ζ 198-9	45
i. 64	223	ρ 218	88
iii. 44	213	ω 12	49
viii. 24	105-6, 108-9, 111	Hyginus, <i>Fab.</i> 99-100	55
viii. 30	118	106	45
Diog. Laert. v. 94, viii. 40, 53, ix. 26	114	Hyperides, κατὰ Ἀθηνογένους	112
Epiphanius, <i>Adv. haeres.</i> iii. p. 1093	212	Iamblichus, <i>Protrept.</i>	94
Euripides, <i>Hec.</i> 70	50	Itin. Anton.	206, 210

VII. PASSAGES DISCUSSED

277

	PAGE		PAGE
Josephus, <i>Arch.</i> xv. 8. 5	215	Plutarch, <i>De ser. num. vind.</i> 7	105; 108-9
Libanius, <i>Or. cont. Sev.</i> iii, p. 251	105-6	Ptolemy iv. 5	204-16
Luke v. 12-16	238	Rufinus, <i>Hist. Mon.</i> v	26
xi. 11	241	Schol. Apollon. Rhod. i. 916	55
xviii. 11-14	238	Eurip. <i>Tr.</i> 1128	88
Lysias, <i>κατὰ Διογένους</i>	112	Hom. M 292	45
Manetho s. v. <i>Τόσορθρος</i>	221	Pind. <i>Pyth.</i> iii. 167	88
Mark i. 40-5	238	Scylax, <i>Peripl.</i> 105	213
vi. 13	241	Socrates, <i>Hist.</i> v. 22	19, 28
Matthew viii. 2-4	238, 241	Stephanus Byz.	205, 209, 212
xiv. 13-14	238	Stobaeus, <i>Ecl. phys.</i> i. 41	224
xxviii. 19	241	<i>Flor.</i> 27. 1	245
Nicolaüs Damasc. Fr. 58	107	Strabo p. 43	49
61	105-6, 109	382	107
Pausanias ii. 8. 1 and vi. 19. 2-3	105-6, 108, 111	756	213
Phaedrus i. 4	247	758	215
Philip, gospel of	239	760	213
Philodemus, <i>Περὶ Εὐσεβ.</i> 10	49	779	210
Pliny, <i>N. H.</i> v. 9	209	788	204
39	210	792	209
49	209	799	210, 212-13
64	210	800	207, 211
68	213	801	212, 225
81	215	802	203, 207-10
Plutarch, <i>De Is. et Os.</i> 3	210, 212	803	205, 212, 218
6	219	805	210
9	207	807	203
10	217	Suidas s.v. <i>Ἡρακλείδης</i>	114
60	210	<i>μαρμαρυγή</i>	214
61	217	<i>Χοιρίδος</i>	245
<i>De malign. Herod.</i> 12	216	Theopompus Fr. 101 (Grenfell-Hunt)	231
		Thucydides viii. 92	111

(b) PAPYRI AND INSCRIPTIONS.

	PAGE		PAGE
P. Amherst 2	236	C. I. G. xii. v. 14	191, 204, 206, 209, 212-13, 216-18, 220
128. 56	211	P. Flor. 298	26
B. G. U. 625	209	P. Giessen 12 (ed. F. Fischer)	157
954	35	55. 2	22
Berl. Klassikertexte, v. 2, p. 12	57	P. Grenf. ii. 112 (a). 1	37
P. Brit. Mus. 46. 148	212	P. Hamburg 39	209
121. 495	203	P. Leyden V. vii. 23	218
122. 28	218	P. Klein. Form. 299	25
921	209	627	40
1419. 526	38	743	39
P. Cairo dem. 31169	191, 217	783	24
C. I. G. 4683 b. 1	212		

	PAGE		PAGE
P. Oxy. 16	157	P. Oxy. 1178	127
43 verso. 1. 10	23, 38	1180	157
141. 3	25	1224	238-9, 241
146. 1	24, 36	1234	56-7
147. 1	24, 36	1245	157
225	157	1246	157
425	236	1247	157
696	157	unpublished	111, 212, 213, 242
842	107, 111	P. Rev. Laws xxxi. 6	204, 206
853	157	xxxii. 8	211
878	157	lx. 18	205-6
879	157	lxvii. 8	211
880	157	P. Rylands 78. 5	209
886. 2-5	236	Coptic 461	41
1011	88, 90	P. S. I. 63	35
1038. 23	23	P. Stud. Pal. x. 35	24, 29, 37
1053. 23	39	297 verso. i. 6	25
1150	25, 37	P. Tebt. 313. 2	203
1151	23, 25, 35, 37	329. 3	241
1173	12-13	P. Wessely (<i>Wien. Stud.</i> vii)	157

307

ΧΟΥΡΙΛΟΥ ΤΙΟΙΝΑΤ
 ΒΑΤΙΚΑ ΜΗΔΙΤΕΡ

No. 1399

ΤΙΕ
 ΕΠΑ
 ΕΠΙΕΡΑΙΑ
 ΤΩΝ
 ΤΕΚΕΡΑΙΑ
 ΣΤΕΓΙΑΝΟΛΙΑ
 ΑΡΧΘΕΙΟΝΙΥΦ
 ΩΝΙΔΕΙ ΤΕΝΘΟ
 ΕΝΒΥΟ ΕΙΔΕΣΚ
 ΝΕΘΥΟΥΤΙΕΡ
 ΕΛΑΙΕΤΕΚΥΝΑ
 ΒΑΙΟΚΑΠΥΤΑ
 ΣΡΕΙΟΝΤΟ ΣΕΡΙΚΤΙ
 ΠΙΕΡΙΚΑ
 ΝΕΑ
 ΡΕΡΒΟΥ

ΕΝΟΙ
 ΩΟΟΗ
 ΟΥΠΙ
 ΕΠΕΘΟΚ
 ΙΟΠΕΟΛΙΕΤΑ
 ΜΕΝΤΙΑ
 ΟΥΕΙΟΤΕΝΟΛΑ
 ΝΕΟΝΔΙΟΝΕΡ
 ΒΟΡΕΩΝΕΥΤΙΠ
 ΕΡΕΔΟΠΟΛΥΡΕ
 ΟΥΑΠΤΑΕΟΡΡ

ΟΒΑ
 ΠΡ
 Π
 ΠΠΗΝΔΙΣΤ
 ΔΩΝΟΣΕΡΙΣΘ
 ΙΟΠΙΟΛΕΕΑ
 ΑΡΤΑΓΙΕΛΙΑ
 ΚΥΡΥΤΕΕΝΙΕ
 ΚΑΙΝΑΥΣΑ
 ΗΝΩΕΙΔΕΡΕΙΧ
 ΝΟΡΟΥΣΑΝ
 ΜΩΝΙΠΛΑΥ
 ΓΙΟΝΙΑΝΥΑ
 ΟΑΝΑΡΤΙΤΙ
 ΔΑΝΑΚΤΟ
 ΟΟΡΥΤΕΣ
 ΑΚΑΥΟΝΑΛΛ
 ΑΛΑΙΤ
 ΜΑΤΑΙΟΕΡΟ
 ΑΡΥΤΕΤ

ΩΒΑΡΒΙΤΙ... ΚΑΤΗΛΑ... ΔΟΝ...
 ΝΣΠΙΛΙΟΝ... ΕΥΡΑΝΚΑΠ...
 ΑΔ... Μ... ΣΡΑ... Μ...
 Χ... Μ... Π...
 ΚΑΙ... Μ...
 ΕΥ... ΟΝ...
 ΣΥ... Ν...
 ΚΥ... Ο...
 ΑΜ... Μ...
 ΑΝ... Ν...
 ΑΥ... Ο...
 ΤΑ...
 Χ...
 Π...
 ΝΑ...
 ΠΛ... Ο...
 Μ...
 ΟΥ...
 Ν...
 Σ... Ο...
 ΒΡ... Ο...
 Π... Ο...

No. 1361. Fr. 1

No. 1376. Col. iv

ΚΑ...
 Η... Κ...
 Π... Α...
 Α... Α...
 Ε... Α...
 ΚΑ... Ο...
 Χ... Ο...
 Ν... Ο...
 Ε... Ο...
 ΟΥ... Ο...
 Τ... Ο...
 Κ... Ο...

Fr. 2

Μ... Π...
 Β... Π...
 Ν... Π...
 Π... Π...
 Π... Π...
 Π... Π...
 Π... Π...
 Π... Π...
 Π... Π...
 Π... Π...
 Π... Π...

Fr. 4

No. 1359

Π...
 Π...
 Π...
 Π...
 Π...
 Π...
 Π...
 Π...

No. 1361. Fr. 4

Η ΟΥΔΕ ΠΙΘΟΙ ΓΙΝΟΜΕΝΟΝ ΟΥΔ ΟΥΔ ΟΙΣ
 ΗΜΑΡΟ ΕΣΤΕ ΟΙΣ ΕΣΚΑΝΑΓΟΥΣΙ ΧΟΕΣ .
 ΙΚΑΡΙΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΠΑΙΔΟΣ ΑΓΝΕΠΕΤΙ ΣΝΑΓΙΣΤΥΝ
 ΑΤΟΙΣΙΝ ΟΙΚΤΙΣΤΗ ΣΟΝ ΦΛΟΟΗΡΙ ΓΟΝΗ
 ΑΤΙ
 ΕΣΕΝ ΟΜΗΘΕΣ ΕΣΕΝ ΔΕ ΝΥΤΟΙΣΙ
 ΣΕ ΝΟΝ ΟΣΑ
 ΜΕΜΒΑΚΩ ΚΑΙ ΤΑΤΑ ΧΡΕΟΣ ΗΝ ΔΕ ΓΕΝΕΤΑ ΗΝ
 ΤΟΣΩΣΥΝ Η ΜΕΙΧΟΝΕΙ ΟΚΛΙΣΙ ΗΝ
 ΟΥΚ ΕΠΙΤΑΔΑ ΔΑΙΝΟΣ ΟΜΗΡΙΚΟΣ ΑΙΕΝΟΜΕΙΟΝ
 ΟΥΘΟΣ ΣΥΝ ΕΥΔΗΣ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΟΜΟΙΟΝ ΑΓΕΙ
 ΚΑΤΑΡΟΣ ΕΠΙ ΚΙΗΝ ΜΕΝΑ ΠΕΣΤΥΓΕ ΔΑΝΔΟΝ ΑΜΥΣΤΙ
 ΟΙΝΟΥ ΤΟΥΤΟ ΑΙΓΩΙ ΔΗ ΑΣΤΟΚΙΣΣΥΡΙΟΙ
 ΤΟΥΤΟ ΤΟΥΤΟ ΑΣΛΕΖΑΙΝΤΕ ΤΕΙΧΟΝΤΟΣ ΑΜΕΙΣΟΥ
 ΤΟΤΙΣΙΝ ΕΣΑΗΝΣ ΟΝΟΜΑ ΚΑΙ ΓΝΕΗΝ
 ΗΝ ΔΕ ΠΟΣΟ ΔΑΛΗΘΕΣ ΤΟΥΤΟ ΝΟΝ ΥΛΑΤΟ ΑΙΣΑ
 ΑΔΑΣΤΙΚΑ ΜΕΣΧΕΣΟΙ ΕΣΕΝ ΜΕΘΕΣΟΙ
 ΤΗΝ ΗΜΕΙΣ ΕΣΕΝ ΕΣΕΝ ΕΣΕΝ ΕΣΕΝ ΕΣΕΝ
 ΤΟΥΔΟ ΜΕΙΣ ΕΣΕΝ ΕΣΕΝ ΕΣΕΝ ΕΣΕΝ ΕΣΕΝ
 ΑΤΙΣ ΕΣΕΝ ΕΣΕΝ ΕΣΕΝ ΕΣΕΝ ΕΣΕΝ ΕΣΕΝ
 ΒΑΛΛΟΜΕΝ ΧΑΛΕΠΩΙ ΦΑΙΜΑΚΟΝ ΕΝ ΠΟΜΑΤΙ
 ΕΣΕΝ ΕΣΕΝ ΕΣΕΝ ΕΣΕΝ ΕΣΕΝ ΕΣΕΝ ΕΣΕΝ
 ΕΣΕΝ ΕΣΕΝ ΕΣΕΝ ΕΣΕΝ ΕΣΕΝ ΕΣΕΝ ΕΣΕΝ
 ΜΕΙΔΟΝ ΕΣΕΝ ΕΣΕΝ ΕΣΕΝ ΕΣΕΝ ΕΣΕΝ
 ΗΝ ΔΑΚΟΝ ΕΣΕΝ ΕΣΕΝ ΕΣΕΝ ΕΣΕΝ ΕΣΕΝ
 ΤΕΥΔΕΝ ΕΚΕΝ ΕΣΕΝ ΕΣΕΝ ΕΣΕΝ ΕΣΕΝ

ΕΟΙΣ ΙΥΝΩΝ
 ΑΙΜΗΛΥΤΗ
 ΟΣΤΟΥΔΑΝ
 ΙΤΙΝΕΩΝ
 ΕΡΑ...
 ΚΑΙ ΚΑΚΙ...
 ΓΑΡ ΕΙΣ ΑΥΤΟΥΣ
 ΚΑΤΟΜΝΥΣΘΑΙ
 ΔΙΔΟΝΤΕΣ ΕΞ
 ΚΑΙ ΜΝΥΜΕ
 ΤΩΝ ΕΡΗΜΕΝΩΝ
 ΤΟΛΛΑ... ΤΙΣ ΕΥ
 ΤΟΙΣ ΤΟΛΕΡ... ΤΗ
 ΤΟΙΣ ΔΑΔΥΜΕΘΩ
 ΤΕΝ... ΝΕΣΟΝ
 ΤΗ... ΚΑΙ ΕΛΑΤ
 ΤΟ... ΕΘΑΙΕΣΟΝ
 ΤΟ... ΚΑΙ ΚΑΝ...
 ΤΗ... ΝΕΣΟΝ
 ΜΕΝ... ΝΤΙΣ
 ΟΣΤΟΙ... ΑΥΤΑ... ΠΡΟ
 ΜΕΝ... ΟΙ... ΤΙΚΟΥ
 ΔΟΙ... ΤΙ... ΤΕ
 ΠΑΡΑ... ΤΩΝ... ΝΟ
 ΣΩΝ... ΤΟΙ... ΕΙ... Η
 ΟΙ... ΤΕ... Ν... Τ... Τ... Τ...
 ΟΙ... ΕΛ... Τ... Τ... Τ...

ΟΥ...
 Ν...
 ΜΟΙ... Π...
 Δ...
 ΠΡΟ...
 Τ... ΑΥΤ... Τ...
 Ν... Υ... Δ... ΚΑΙ
 ΟΥΧ... ΚΑ... Ν... Ο... Ν... ΕΙ
 ΚΟΥ... Ρ... Ν... Ο... Γ... Ε... Τ... Ο...
 ΤΟ... Ν... Μ... Ε... Ν... Ε... Π... Τ... Ρ... Ε
 Π... Ε... Τ... Ω... Π... Α... Σ... Χ... Ο... Ν
 Τ... Π... Θ... Ε... Ι... Ν... Κ... Α... Π... Ο...
 Δ... Ρ... Ο... Ν... Τ... Ι... Δ... Ρ... Α... Δ... Α...
 ΚΑ... Ο... Υ... Τ... Ε... Ν... Τ... Α... Υ
 Θ... Α... Δ... Ι... Ε... Φ... Ω... Λ... Υ... Ε... Τ... Ο... Ν
 Π... Α... Σ... Χ... Ο... Ν... Τ... Α... Μ... Η
 Γ... Ι... Α... Θ... Ε... Ι... Ο... Υ... Δ... Ε... Τ... Ο... Ν
 Δ... Ρ... Ω... Ν... Τ... Α... Δ... Ρ... Α... Σ... Α...
 Ε... Ι... Σ... Τ... Ε... Τ... Η... Ν... Τ... Ι... Μ... Ο...
 Ρ... Ι... Α... Ν... Α... Ν... Φ... Ε... Ρ... Ο...
 Μ... Ε... Ν... Ο... Ι... Υ... Δ... Ε... Ν
 Ι... Α... Ι... Σ... Τ... Ε... Ρ... Ο... Ν... Ο... Π... Η
 Ο... Ι... Ε... Π... Ο... Ι... Ο... Τ... Ο... Τ... Ι
 Η... Ο... Ι... Δ... Ρ... Α...
 Τ... Ε... Ο... Ι... Τ... Α... Ρ...
 Δ... Ο... Ω... Ε... Ε... Ι...
 Α... Υ... Ν... Α
 Ο... Τ... Α... Υ
 Ο... Ν... Α... Ε... Ι
 Α... Π... Ο... Ι... Δ... Α... Ρ... Α
 Ν... Ε... Ι... Ο... Β... Α... Ι

Ο... Η... Τ... Ε... Ρ... Τ...
 Τ... Η... Ι... Ο... Ρ... Α...
 Κ... Α... Τ... Η... Γ... Ο...
 Τ... Π... Ε... Ι... Θ... Ω... Α...
 Τ... Ο... Ι... Ε... Π... Τ... Ι... Η... Τ... Τ... Ο...
 Κ... Ο... Τ... Η... Τ... Ι... Ο...
 Π... Α... Ρ... Κ...
 Μ... Α... Σ... Κ...
 Κ... Α... Ι...
 Δ... Υ... Κ...
 Δ... Ε... Ο...
 Ο... Υ... Δ...
 Μ... Α...
 Τ... Ο...
 Ο... Ω... Ε... Ε...
 Ε... Δ...
 Α... Τ... Ο...
 Ο... Α...
 Ο... Α...
 Ο... Α...
 Ο... Α...
 Ο... Α...
 Ο... Α...
 Ο... Α...
 Ο... Α...
 Ο... Α...
 Ο... Α...

Fragmentary Greek text on the left side of the page, including a large section with a prominent 'X' and several smaller fragments below it.

No. 1370. Fr. 9 verso

Fragmentary Greek text in the upper left section, including a large block with a prominent 'X' and several smaller fragments below it.

No. 1371 recto

Fragmentary Greek text in the upper right section, including a large block with a prominent 'X' and several smaller fragments below it.

No. 1369. Frs. 1-2 recto

Fr. 1370. Fr. 3 recto

EGYPT EXPLORATION FUND

GRAECO-ROMAN BRANCH.

THE EGYPT EXPLORATION FUND, which has conducted Archaeological research in Egypt since 1882, in 1897 started a special department, called the Graeco-Roman Branch, for the discovery and publication of remains of classical antiquity and early Christianity in Egypt.

The Graeco-Roman Branch issues annual volumes, each of about 250 quarto pages, with facsimile plates of the more important papyri, under the editorship of DRs. GRENFELL and HUNT.

A subscription of One Guinea to the Graeco-Roman Branch entitles subscribers to the annual volume, and to attendance at the Fund's lectures in London and elsewhere. A donation of £25 constitutes life membership. Subscriptions may be sent to the Honorary Treasurers—for England, Mr. J. GRAFTON MILNE, 37 Great Russell St., London, W.C.; and for America, Mr. CHESTER I. CAMPBELL, 527 Tremont Temple, Boston, Mass.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE EGYPT EXPLORATION FUND.

MEMOIRS OF THE FUND.

- I. THE STORE CITY OF PITHOM AND THE ROUTE OF THE EXODUS. For 1883-4. By EDOUARD NAVILLE. Thirteen Plates and Plans. (*Fourth and Revised Edition.*) 25s.
- II. TANIS, Part I. For 1884-5. By W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE. Eighteen Plates and two Plans. (*Second Edition.*) 25s.
- III. NAUKRATIS, Part I. For 1885-6. By W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE. With Chapters by CECIL SMITH, ERNEST A. GARDNER, and BARCLAY V. HEAD. Forty-four Plates and Plans. (*Second Edition.*) 25s.
- IV. GOSHEN AND THE SHRINE OF SAFT-EL-HENNEH. For 1886-7. By EDOUARD NAVILLE. Eleven Plates and Plans. (*Second Edition.*) 25s.
- V. TANIS, Part II; including TELL DEFENNEH (The Biblical 'Tahpanhes') and TELL NEBESHEH. For 1887-8. By W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE, F. LL. GRIFFITH, and A. S. MURRAY. Fifty-one Plates and Plans. 25s.
- VI. NAUKRATIS, Part II. For 1888-9. By ERNEST A. GARDNER and F. LL. GRIFFITH. Twenty-four Plates and Plans. 25s.
- VII. THE CITY OF ONIAS AND THE MOUND OF THE JEW. The Antiquities of Tell-el-Yahûdiyeh. *An Extra Volume.* By EDOUARD NAVILLE and F. LL. GRIFFITH. Twenty-six Plates and Plans. 25s.

- VIII. BUBASTIS. For 1889-90. By EDOUARD NAVILLE. Fifty-four Plates and Plans. 25s.
- IX. TWO HIEROGLYPHIC PAPYRI FROM TANIS. *An Extra Volume.* Containing THE SIGN PAPYRUS (a Syllabary). By F. LL. GRIFFITH. THE GEOGRAPHICAL PAPYRUS (an Almanac). By W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE. With Remarks by HEINRICH BRUGSCH. (*Out of print.*)
- X. THE FESTIVAL HALL OF OSORKON II (BUBASTIS). For 1890-1. By EDOUARD NAVILLE. Thirty-nine Plates. 25s.
- XI. AHNAS EL MEDINEH. For 1891-2. By EDOUARD NAVILLE. Eighteen Plates. And THE TOMB OF PAHERI AT EL KAB. By J. J. TYLOR and F. LL. GRIFFITH. Ten Plates. 25s.
- XII. DEIR EL BAHARI, Introductory. For 1892-3. By EDOUARD NAVILLE. Fifteen Plates and Plans. 25s.
- XIII. DEIR EL BAHARI, Part I. For 1893-4. By EDOUARD NAVILLE. Plates I-XXIV (three coloured) with Description. Royal folio. 30s.
- XIV. DEIR EL BAHARI, Part II. For 1894-5. By EDOUARD NAVILLE. Plates XXV-LV (two coloured) with Description. Royal folio. 30s.
- XV. DESHÂSHEH. For 1895-6. By W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE. Photogravure and other Plates. 25s.
- XVI. DEIR EL BAHARI, Part III. For 1896-7. By EDOUARD NAVILLE. Plates LVI-LXXXVI (two coloured) with Description. Royal folio. 30s.
- XVII. DENDEREH. For 1897-8. By W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE. Thirty-eight Plates. 25s. (Extra Plates of Inscriptions. Forty Plates. 10s.)
- XVIII. ROYAL TOMBS OF THE FIRST DYNASTY. For 1898-9. By W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE. Sixty-eight Plates. 25s.
- XIX. DEIR EL BAHARI, Part IV. For 1899-1900. By EDOUARD NAVILLE. Plates LXXXVII-CXVIII (two coloured) with Description. Royal folio. 30s.
- XX. DIOSPOLIS PARVA. *An Extra Volume.* By W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE. Forty-nine Plates. (*Out of print.*)
- XXI. THE ROYAL TOMBS OF THE EARLIEST DYNASTIES, Part II. For 1900-1. By W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE. Sixty-three Plates. 25s. (Thirty-five extra Plates, 10s.)
- XXII. ABYDOS, Part I. For 1901-2. By W. M. F. PETRIE. Eighty-one Plates. 25s.
- XXIII. EL AMRAH AND ABYDOS. *An Extra Volume.* By D. RANDALL-MACIVER, A. C. MACE, and F. LL. GRIFFITH. Sixty Plates. 25s.
- XXIV. ABYDOS, Part II. For 1902-3. By W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE. Sixty-four Plates. 25s.
- XXV. ABYDOS, Part III. *An Extra Volume.* By C. T. CURRELLY, E. R. AYRTON, and A. E. P. WEIGALL, &c. Sixty-one Plates. 25s.
- XXVI. EHNASYA. For 1903-4. By W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE. Forty-three Plates. 25s. (ROMAN EHNASYA. Thirty-two extra Plates. 10s.)
- XXVII. DEIR EL BAHARI, Part V. For 1904-5. By EDOUARD NAVILLE. Plates CXIX-CL with Description. Royal folio. 30s.
- XXVIII. THE ELEVENTH DYNASTY TEMPLE AT DEIR EL BAHARI, Part I. For 1905-6. By EDOUARD NAVILLE and H. R. HALL. Thirty-one Plates. 25s.
- XXIX. DEIR EL BAHARI, Part VI. For 1906-7. By EDOUARD NAVILLE. Plates CLI-CLXXIV (one coloured) with Description. Royal folio. 30s.
- XXX. THE ELEVENTH DYNASTY TEMPLE AT DEIR EL BAHARI, Part II. For 1907-8. By EDOUARD NAVILLE. Twenty-four Plates. 25s.
- XXXI. PRE-DYNASTIC CEMETERY AT EL MAHASNA. For 1908-9. By E. R. AYRTON and W. L. S. LOAT. 25s.
- XXXII. THE ELEVENTH DYNASTY TEMPLE AT DEIR EL BAHARI, Part III. For 1909-10. By EDOUARD NAVILLE, H. R. HALL, and C. T. CURRELLY. Thirty-six Plates. 25s.
- XXXIII. CEMETERIES OF ABYDOS, Part I. For 1910-11. By EDOUARD NAVILLE, T. E. PEET, and H. R. HALL. 25s.
- XXXIV. CEMETERIES OF ABYDOS, Part II. For 1911-12. By T. E. PEET. 25s.
- XXXV. CEMETERIES OF ABYDOS, Part III. For 1912-13. By T. E. PEET and W. L. S. LOAT. 25s.
- XXXVI. INSCRIPTIONS FROM SINAI. By T. E. PEET and A. H. GARDINER. (*In preparation.*)

ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

Edited by F. LL. GRIFFITH.

- I. BENI HASAN, Part I. For 1890-1. By PERCY E. NEWBERRY. With Plans by G. W. FRASER. Forty-nine Plates (four coloured). (*Out of print.*)
- II. BENI HASAN, Part II. For 1891-2. By PERCY E. NEWBERRY. With Appendix, Plans, and Measurements by G. W. FRASER. Thirty-seven Plates (two coloured). 25s.
- III. EL BERSHEH, Part I. For 1892-3. By PERCY E. NEWBERRY. Thirty-four Plates (two coloured). 25s.
- IV. EL BERSHEH, Part II. For 1893-4. By F. LL. GRIFFITH and PERCY E. NEWBERRY. With Appendix by G. W. FRASER. Twenty-three Plates (two coloured). 25s.
- V. BENI HASAN, Part III. For 1894-5. By F. LL. GRIFFITH. (Hieroglyphs, and manufacture, &c., of Flint Knives.) Ten coloured Plates. 25s.
- VI. HIEROGLYPHS FROM THE COLLECTIONS OF THE EGYPT EXPLORATION FUND. For 1895-6. By F. LL. GRIFFITH. Nine coloured Plates. 25s.
- VII. BENI HASAN, Part IV. For 1896-7. By F. LL. GRIFFITH. (Illustrating beasts and birds, arts, crafts, &c.) Twenty-seven Plates (twenty-one coloured). 25s.
- VIII. THE MASTABA OF PTAHHETEP AND AKHETHETEP AT SAQQAREH, Part I. For 1897-8. By NORMAN DE G. DAVIES and F. LL. GRIFFITH. Thirty-one Plates (three coloured). 25s.
- IX. THE MASTABA OF PTAHHETEP AND AKHETHETEP AT SAQQAREH, Part II. For 1898-9. By N. DE G. DAVIES and F. LL. GRIFFITH. Thirty-five Plates. 25s.
- X. THE ROCK TOMBS OF SHEIKH SAÏD. For 1899-1900. By N. DE G. DAVIES. Thirty-five Plates. 25s.
- XI. THE ROCK TOMBS OF DEIR EL GEBRÂWI, Part I. For 1900-1. By N. DE G. DAVIES. Twenty-seven Plates (two coloured). 25s.
- XII. DEIR EL GEBRÂWI, Part II. For 1901-2. By N. DE G. DAVIES. Thirty Plates (two coloured). 25s.
- XIII. THE ROCK TOMBS OF EL AMARNA, Part I. For 1902-3. By N. DE G. DAVIES. Forty-one Plates. 25s.
- XIV. EL AMARNA, Part II. For 1903-4. By N. DE G. DAVIES. Forty-seven Plates. 25s.
- XV. EL AMARNA, Part III. For 1904-5. By N. DE G. DAVIES. Forty Plates. 25s.
- XVI. EL AMARNA, Part IV. For 1905-6. By N. DE G. DAVIES. Forty-five Plates. 25s.
- XVII. EL AMARNA, Part V. For 1906-7. By N. DE G. DAVIES. Forty-four Plates. 25s.
- XVIII. EL AMARNA, Part VI. For 1907-8. By N. DE G. DAVIES. Forty-four Plates. 25s.
- XIX. THE ISLAND OF MEROË. By J. W. CROWFOOT, and MEROITIC INSCRIPTIONS, Part I. For 1908-9. By F. LL. GRIFFITH. Thirty-five Plates. 25s.
- XX. MEROITIC INSCRIPTIONS, Part II. For 1909-10. By F. LL. GRIFFITH. Forty-eight Plates. 25s.
- XXI. FIVE THEBAN TOMBS. For 1910-11. By N. DE G. DAVIES. Forty-three Plates. 25s.
- XXII. THE ROCK TOMBS OF MEIR, Part I. For 1911-12. By A. M. BLACKMAN. Thirty-three Plates. 25s.
- XXIII. THE ROCK TOMBS OF MEIR, Part II. For 1912-13. By A. M. BLACKMAN. (*In preparation.*)

GRAECO-ROMAN BRANCH.

- I. THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI, Part I. For 1897-8. By B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT. Eight Collotype Plates. (*Out of print.*)
- II. THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI, Part II. For 1898-9. By B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT. Eight Collotype Plates. 25s.
- III. FAYÛM TOWNS AND THEIR PAPYRI. For 1899-1900. By B. P. GRENFELL, A. S. HUNT, and D. G. HOGARTH. Eighteen Plates. 25s.
- IV. THE TEBTUNIS PAPYRI. Double Volume for 1900-1 and 1901-2. By B. P. GRENFELL, A. S. HUNT, and J. G. SMYLY. Nine Collotype Plates. (*Not for sale.*)
- V. THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI, Part III. For 1902-3. By B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT. Six Collotype Plates. 25s.
- VI. THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI, Part IV. For 1903-4. By B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT. Eight Collotype Plates. 25s.

- VII. THE HIBEH PAPYRI, Part I. Double Volume for 1904-5 and 1905-6. By B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT. Ten Collotype Plates. 45s.
- VIII. THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI, Part V. For 1906-7. By B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT. Seven Collotype Plates. 25s.
- IX. THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI, Part VI. For 1907-8. By B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT. Six Collotype Plates. 25s.
- X. THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI, Part VII. For 1908-9. By A. S. HUNT. Six Collotype Plates. 25s.
- XI. THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI, Part VIII. For 1909-10. By A. S. HUNT. Seven Collotype Plates. 25s.
- XII. THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI, Part IX. For 1910-11. By A. S. HUNT. Six Collotype Plates. 25s.
- XIII. THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI, Part X. For 1911-12. By B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT. Six Collotype Plates. 25s.
- XIV. THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI, Part XI. For 1912-13. By B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT. Seven Collotype Plates. 25s.
- XV. THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI, Part XII. For 1913-14. By B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT. (*In preparation.*)

ANNUAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL REPORTS.

(Yearly Summaries by F. G. KENYON, W. E. CRUM, and the Officers of the Society, with Maps.)
 Edited by F. LL. GRIFFITH.

- THE SEASON'S WORK. For 1890-1. By EDOUARD NAVILLE, PERCY E. NEWBERRY, and G. W. FRASER. 2s. 6d.
- For 1892-3 and 1893-4. 2s. 6d. each.
- „ 1894-5. 3s. 6d. Containing Report of D. G. HOGARTH'S Excavations in Alexandria.
- „ 1895-6. 3s. With Illustrated Article on the Transport of Obelisks by EDOUARD NAVILLE.
- „ 1896-7. 2s. 6d. With Articles on Oxyrhynchus and its Papyri by B. P. GRENFELL, and a Thucydides Papyrus from Oxyrhynchus by A. S. HUNT.
- „ 1897-8. 2s. 6d. With Illustrated Article on Excavations at Hierakonpolis by W. M. F. PETRIE.
- „ 1898-9. 2s. 6d. With Article on the Position of Lake Moeris by B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT.
- „ 1899-1900. 2s. 6d. With Article on Knossos in its Egyptian Relations by A. J. EVANS.
- And twelve successive years, 2s. 6d. each.

A JOURNAL OF EGYPTIAN ARCHAEOLOGY (issued Quarterly). Commenced January, 1914. 6s. a part, or £1 1s. a year to Subscribers.

SPECIAL PUBLICATIONS.

- ΛΟΓΙΑ ΙΗΣΟΥ: 'Sayings of Our Lord,' from an Early Greek Papyrus. By B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT. 2s. (with Collotypes) and 6d. net.
- NEW SAYINGS OF JESUS AND FRAGMENT OF A LOST GOSPEL. By B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT. 1s. net.
- FRAGMENT OF AN UNCANONICAL GOSPEL. By B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT. 1s. net.
- ATLAS OF ANCIENT EGYPT. With Letterpress and Index. (*Out of print.*)
- GUIDE TO THE TEMPLE OF DEIR EL BAHARI. With Plan. (*Out of print.*)
- COPTIC OSTRACA. By W. E. CRUM. 10s. 6d. net.
- THE THEBAN TOMB SERIES, Vol. I. THE TOMB OF AMENEMHET (No. 82). By NINA DE G. DAVIES and A. H. GARDINER. 30s.

Slides from Fund Photographs may be obtained through Messrs. Newton & Co., 37 King Street, Covent Garden, W.C., and Prints from Mr. R. C. Murray, 37 Dartmouth Park Hill, N.W.

Offices of the Egypt Exploration Fund:

37 GREAT RUSSELL STREET, LONDON, W.C., AND
 527 TREMONT TEMPLE, BOSTON, MASS., U.S.A.

Agents:

KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & Co., 68-74 CARTER LANE, E.C.
 BERNARD QUARITCH, 11 GRAFTON STREET, NEW BOND STREET, W.
 ASHER & Co., 14 BEDFORD STREET, COVENT GARDEN, W.C.
 C. F. CLAY, CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, FETTER LANE, LONDON, E.C., AND
 100 PRINCES STREET, EDINBURGH
 HUMPHREY MILFORD, OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, AMEN CORNER, E.C., AND
 29-35 WEST 32ND STREET, NEW YORK, U.S.A.

TRENT UNIVERSITY



0 1164 0206437 6

PA3315 .08 Pt. 11
Oxyrhynchus papyri

DATE

ISSUED TO

~~239603~~

239603

